

THE
CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

No. 11.]

NOVEMBER 1, 1824.

[VOL. VI.]

Religious Communications.

On "The Moral and Religious Improvement that may be derived from Natural Beauty and Sublimity."

THERE is no part of the day better fitted for devotion, than what passes between the setting sun and the close of evening twilight. The sober aspect of all things at the hour of departing day—the gloom of darkness, and, above all, the profound stillness, which, at this season, reigns over every object, are well fitted to awaken contemplation, and lead the mind, as it walks abroad, to thoughts of death and eternity.

I much delight in these evening rambles, and am sometimes filled with astonishment and pleasure, when I discover how all objects around me are shadows of heavenly and divine things. The earth with its scenes of grandeur; and the heavens shining with stars, lead, by association, to the more glorious beauties of the new earth and new heavens; the departing light, the fading splendours of evening, and the fleeting vapours and exhalations, are so many mementos to remind us of the transient nature of all things below; and in the light clouds of the sky, as they are seen dissolving in air, or vanishing in the shades of night, we discover beautiful emblems of earthly joy and mortal happiness.

A mind thus disposed to reflection, may make almost every natural scene an occasion of either raising new and uncommon views of things, or of strengthening familiar truth by

new associations. In this manner, one may find fountains of instruction springing wherever he treads.

Yet it is wonderful how men, that are in the pursuit of happiness, neglect and undervalue these sources of high enjoyment. Many will look in wonder upon the castles and other grand edifices built by the art of man, and yet find no pleasure in the rocks and mountains piled by the hand of the Almighty. They will admire a description in poetry, or a view in painting, and pass by unnoticed those scenes of grandeur in the earth and heavens, in which are seen all the finishings of divine workmanship, and of which the first are only a faint and feeble imitation. They admire the copy but neglect the divine original.

It is easily observed that the works of nature, lovely as they are from their own inherent sublimity and beauty, become wonderfully more so when God is realized as their author, and benevolence as their end. Without this consideration, all their splendour is but dimness; and the man who can give to these objects of Creation no other interest than the impression their forms and colours make upon his senses, is much like one who is gazing upon a well formed countenance without discovering in its features intelligence or goodness.

But he who can discern wisdom and intelligence shining through all things, who can see in them the moral beauty of this origin and end, and who is accustomed, to use the poet's

beautiful imagery, "To look through nature up to nature's God," will nowhere find himself away from enjoyment. He can always cast a smiling look over the earth and heavens, and experience a delight that repetition will never make old, in tracing the perfections of the Divine Being in any, even the smallest of his works. To such a man the dews will drop wisdom, and every bough, plant, and vine, offer the pleasant fruit of instruction.

I have always considered it as a part of the system of Divine Providence, as well as a proof of divine benevolence, that, while he has made earthly pleasures unsatisfactory that we may not rest in them, he has so abundantly provided for us, in his own works, fountains of rational pleasure and improvement. Viewed in this light, we might expect them to be what we find them, more and more improving and delightful the better we are acquainted with them; while most enjoyments lose their relish by being often repeated. There is something so consonant between the emotions of natural and moral beauty, that the mind accustomed to take pleasure in both, soon establishes a connexion between them. It associates ideas of moral excellence with every pleasing object of nature, and will find its love of virtue awakened, whenever these associations are put in motion. There is something to such a mind in a serene azure sky, that seems to reflect the image of virtue. The cloud, the mountain, the rainbow, and the cataract, are objects that have in their view, besides their natural gracefulness and beauty, an associated purity and excellence beyond them. While, therefore, these associations give a new charm to the objects themselves, we shall find our contemplations of moral excellence rendered more pleasing by the emotions we feel on surveying scenes of sublimity and beauty. For this reason, these are the most improving, as well as the most refined and innocent of our pleasures.

Next, therefore, to the word of God, we ought to study his works. In them, if we view them aright, we shall see not only sublimity and beauty in their most perfect forms, but also new proofs of benevolence, and new displays of goodness. From every object of the varied landscape, or shade of the changing seasons—from the brightness of day, or silence of the night—from the mountain, or the stream, will be gathered an influence fitted to religious thought, and to the sweet contemplations of a mind that hopes to dwell on high, in that land where there is no need of the sun to give light by day, or the moon to give light by night; where every echo is praise, where every air is the breath of love, and where waters of life flow down from the heavenly hills.

A SERMON.

Psalm viii. 4.—*What is man that thou art mindful of him?*

THIS exclamation was uttered by the devout Psalmist upon beholding the wonderful works which God has created. *When I consider thy heavens the work of thy fingers, the moon and stars which thou hast ordained; what is man that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man that thou dost visit him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou hast made him to have dominion over the work of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet.* How exalted and how devout must be the views of the man who could write such a passage! He surveyed the works of the great God, with an eye that could mark, and a heart that could feel the display of his glorious attributes; and his tongue was ready to proclaim the high praises of that gracious being who had put all things in subjection under the feet of his frail creature man.

That we may be led to something of the same devout views of the

ways and works of our God, let us attend to the inquiry of our text under the three following divisions:

I. What is man?

II. Wherein is God mindful of him?

III. Why is he thus mindful of him?

I. What is man? This is one of the two most interesting inquiries that a mortal can make. For him to know what himself is, may perhaps be considered of equal importance as to know what God is. Without some knowledge on both of these topics, he can neither know that he needs salvation, nor the terms on which God will save him.—What, then, is man? The answer must be drawn from the declarations of Him that made him, and may be confirmed by his own observation.

1. He is a feeble creature. God declares that he made man of the dust of the earth. His origin is low, though his Maker is divine. His race is not eternal nor self-existent, as he might vainly imagine, if left to a state of total heathenism. He is but a creature. And he is frail. *He cometh forth like a flower and is cut down; he fleeth also as a shadow and continueth not.* And to declare how feeble he is of himself, God says, *he is crushed before the moth.* He is unsubstantial as the mist of the morning. For he is *as a vapor that appeareth for a little while, and then vanisheth away.* Such is man—so frail and feeble. Of himself he has no strength—not even sufficient to sustain himself in existence. Yet,

2. He is an arrogant and self-confident creature. He is as presumptuous on his own might as though he possessed an independent existence, and could control events by his own arm. He speaks of what he shall do, as though he were not subject to the control of another; and when his object is achieved, he says, *mine own arm hath gotten me this; and by my might have I done it.* When God sees fit to prosper his designs and suffer him to go forward in the acqui-

sition of wealth, or the grasping of honors and earthly dominion, his heart is lifted up with pride—he becomes vain-glorious—his desires outstretch his achievements—his presumption equals his desires—and he presses onward in his giddy career, not dreaming, that, the next breath, the Almighty may blast him to nothing. The mighty man glories in his might—the rich man glories in his riches—the wise man glories in his wisdom; but they give not God the glory to whom alone it belongs. They consider not that what they have gained, is by a borrowed strength, and is continued by the slighted goodness of the high possessor; nor do they think how dependent they are for all they hope and all they crave.

3. Man is a miserable creature. As he cannot of himself gain the good things which he covets, so neither has he the power to enjoy them when the rich bounty of heaven pours the profusion into his bosom. The man may have riches, and may feast himself on dainties, and yet his soul be meagre and sad. He may surround himself with dazzling splendour, and yet find all his envied pomp but the ghost of pleasure. Or he may hoard his treasure with the vain promise that he will one day say to his soul, *thou hast much goods laid up for many years, take thine ease.* His day of ease will never come. He can make to himself no heart to enjoy what his hand has gathered.—He may be born to the sceptre of a mighty kingdom; or he may wrest it from the hand of its lawful heir, and may cause nations to bow down before him. But he may yet be an anxious, a restless, a wretched man, unable to draw the least enjoyment from all the pomp with which he is attended, and all the power that waits on his word.

In these things, proud man is inferior to the brutes that perish. The beast that grazes the field, or that prowls the forest, eats to the full of the meat that his Maker giveth him

in due season, and lies quietly down to the repose in which his nature delights. But feasting cannot quiet the soul of man nor lull it to placid enjoyment. Like the king of Babylon, he may go from his banquet and be restless on his midnight bed and his sleep depart from him, he knows not why. The fierce beast assails his foe and overcomes him, and then is happy in the undisputed dominion of what his eye can survey. But man is never satiate with conquest. He pushes on to new countries and at length sighs for new worlds to conquer.—All this is because he is a miserable creature and has it not in his power to make himself happy. If God see fit to give him a contented mind, he may reap enjoyment though possessed of nothing. But happiness is what he can neither purchase nor achieve for himself; and he suffers more here on earth, perhaps than all the combined suffering of the inferior creation.

4. He is a fallen, sinful creature. Originally, God made man upright. He created him of noble rank in the scale of being. The powers of body and mind with which he endowed him, and propensity to love and ability to enjoy his holy Maker which God gave him, evinced his high degree and exalted destination. God made him in his own image; in the image of God created he him. But man being in honour abode not; but, like the angels that kept not their first estate, he made himself vile—debased his heaven-born nature—lost the image of his God—and sunk himself immeasurably low in the scale of moral estimation. From being a son of God without rebuke, and holding a rank among seraphs to stand before God clothed in the purity and splendours of holiness; he became a vile, degraded, and despicable being. His moral character became loathsome in the sight of God, and offensive to every holy eye.—And such he still continues to be by nature. He is now as sin-

ful and as abominable a being in the sight of God and of all heaven, as he was at his first degradation. The race has grown no better by the succession of generations for six thousand years. They are now, by nature, what they were when Cain was born in the image of his fallen father. There is the same aversion to holiness—the same proneness to sin—the same rebellion against God and enmity to all that is good. They are still prone to sin as the sparks to fly upward; they still drink in iniquity like water; but to do good, they have no knowledge. They are the degenerate plants of a strange vine—the apostate children of a fallen father. All the ravages that sin has brought on the race, and all the woes which God has inflicted for their rebellion, have not taught them the wisdom to desist from their impious career. Descendants will not take warning to turn from the footsteps of their self-minded progenitors. So deep and deadly is the root which sin has taken in their hearts! So mad is the infatuation with which they rush on in their warfare against heaven.

Such, my friends, is a brief sketch of man;—So feeble, and yet so arrogant and self-confident; so miserable, and yet so madly bent on sinning against that holy and almighty Being to whom he owes his existence—whom he is bound to serve—and on whom he is dependent for life and breath and all things.

Still God assures us that he is mindful of this his wretched creature man. Surely this must be a wonder in heaven! Well might angels desire to look into these things. Let us, then, look into them; and consider,

II. Wherein God is mindful of man.

1. He upholds him in existence. We have already dwelt on the feebleness of man and have considered the fact that he could not even sustain himself in being. For this, he is entirely dependent on some other

being; and it is that gracious God against whom he is sinning, that holds him up from annihilation. God must needs be constantly mindful of this frail being, or he would be lost out of existence—he would fall into his native nothing. His visitation sustains his spirit.

2. God has created and now upholds all things in this world for his good. This is the view which the Psalmist gives us in those sublime verses connected with the text. You see how it called forth the devout astonishment of the holy man, that the Creator of so wonderful a system of worlds as we behold revolving in the evening sky, should be so mindful of man as to put all things in subjection under his feet;—the earth and every creeping thing that moveth on the face of the earth. It is for the use of man that this world was created and is sustained in being, and peopled with the countless tribes of birds, beasts, and fishes. And when it has served the purpose of man as long as God shall see fit to continue his generations, it is to be burnt up as of no further use. Thus God is mindful of his sinful creature in preparing and preserving a fit dwelling for him, and in furnishing it with all the animals needful for his use. He also shows his care for him, in the kindness in which he causes the seasons to revolve and seed time and harvest to fail not. These things is he doing for a race of beings that are at enmity with him by wicked works.

But the care with which he is mindful for their earthly good, is small compared with that which he has shown for their souls. I therefore observe,

3. That he has given his Son to die for their salvation. Greater love cannot be displayed. It is doubtless the greatest exhibition of regard—the greatest proof that he is mindful of them which even God himself could give. God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on him should

not perish but have everlasting life. Herein is love; not that we loved him, but that he loved us and gave his Son to die for us. While we were yet enemies, Christ died for us;—and he died the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. This must surely be the highest proof which even God can give, that he is mindful of man.

But though he can give no one stronger proof of this fact, he can give additional proofs. And these he has given in abundance, some of which I will subjoin.

4. He has given man the volume of his truth. By this, he can grow wise unto salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth. It would be in vain to the great purpose of our entering heaven, that God has given his Son to die for us, if we had no information of his death and of the terms on which we could become interested in his purchase. God has therefore most graciously inspired men to write this information for us; and he has caused it to be handed down in its purity to the present day. Herein he has given us another demonstration of his being mindful of his rebellious creature man.

5. He sends his Holy Spirit to convert men and prepare them for heaven. Notwithstanding God has given his Son to die for man and sent his word to inform him of the fact, still man would not, of himself, regard the precious salvation. His opposition is so great—his hostility so inveterate, that he would reject the counsel of God against himself and put salvation from him. And when he is so headlong prone to his own ruin as to set at nought a crucified Redeemer and trample his word under foot; even then, God sends his Holy Spirit to make him willing in the day of his power and save him from going down to the pit. This, my friends, is what we have seen with our own eyes—and blessed be the God of our salvation, it is what many of us hope God's sovereign

grace has done for our own souls.

These things that have now been enumerated, are among the mighty demonstrations God has given, that he is mindful of his creature man.—Let us inquire,

III. Why he is thus mindful of him.

1. It is because he pities him. He looks upon this infatuated, this wretched, this self-destroyed being, with an eye of compassion. Though he regards him as an exceeding sinner—a deadly rebel against his throne; still he regards him as the work of his own hands—a fallen being that himself has created. And thus beholding him, he has compassion on the soul that he has made, and says; save him from going down to the pit, for I have found a ransom. He pities his present sufferings, and provides most amply for his enjoyment here on earth. He feels for the woes that his sins bring upon him, and provides a Saviour for his ransom. He compassionates him in the infatuated thralldom of rebellion in which he is disposed still to persevere even down to the gates of death; and he sends his word to warn, and his Spirit to convert him from the error of his ways and save his soul alive. This is one reason why God is mindful of man—the glorious attribute of his compassion. Verily it is because he is God and not man, that we are not consumed—that he has any pity for beings who are thus sinning against him and abusing all his goodness.—But,

2. The principal reason why he is thus mindful of man, is to be sought in the illustrious display which he makes of his own glory. For mine own sake do I this, be it known unto you, that my name may be great. But this topic has been so frequently illustrated that I will not prolong the present discourse by dwelling on its details. Suffice it to say, the glorified in heaven, both saints and angels will forever swell the high praises of God the Father, Son, and Ho-

ly Ghost, for this, the most wonderful of all the displays of his glorious character.

As an Improvement of the subject, let us briefly reflect,

1. How great should be our gratitude to God. In whatever light we view this wonderful condescension and mercy of God, we find fresh cause for grateful adoration. The kind remembrance of God is extended towards us in every respect in which we can need it, both for soul and body—both for time and eternity. And when we consider our own characters as we have now done, we find every thing in us to repel his goodness from us. Of what then must our hearts be made, if we find in them no gratitude for such transcendent mercy!

2. How strong are our obligations to devote our talents to God's service. He is constantly putting forth the exercise of his attributes to do us good. His wisdom is contriving, and his power is executing the kindest purposes for our present and eternal welfare. Let me then appeal to the heart of gratitude and ask—shall all this be, and yet will you do nothing in the service of God? Shall he be, as it were serving you and calling forth incessantly his mighty attributes into activity for your welfare, and will you not devote to him the exercise of those talents which he has given you? Shall that God who is himself holy, be doing you good who are a sinner, and who have rebelled against him, and will you now utterly refuse to show an emotion of gratitude by doing what you can to promote his kingdom among men? Let it not be so with those who are bought with a price, and who are bound by every obligation to serve God with their bodies and their spirits which are his.

3. We are taught, by God's example, to be kindly mindful of each other—even of those who are evil and unthankful towards us. Destitute of this disposition, we can neither

enjoy his presence nor stand before him in judgment;—but possessing it, we have a fountain of felicity in the bosom, which combined malice and power can neither destroy nor pollute.

4. What shall we think of those who are not mindful of God? Who speak not of him; who call not on his name; who think not of him?—What, of their wisdom—what of their gratitude—what of their whole moral character—and what of their *latter end*!



To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.

EDWARDS'S VIEWS OF ORIGINAL SIN.

It is a question of some importance in its bearing on the religious controversies of the day, what is the doctrine of Original Sin, as taught by President Edwards. On the authority of this distinguished writer, Unitarians have boldly charged the Orthodox with holding the doctrine of Physical Depravity; and it must be confessed, that the work of Edwards has been held in such high repute by this class of Christians, and has been so often appealed to by them as a triumphant defence of their opinions, that the point at issue chiefly depends on what is the real doctrine maintained in this celebrated treatise.

The doctrine of Physical Depravity, I understand to be this; *that there is con-created with man a substantial property or attribute of his nature, which is in itself sinful and deserving of punishment.*

That I may remove what I suppose to be some misapprehensions of Edwards's doctrine, I shall attempt to show what are, and what are not, his views on the most important points connected with this subject.

1. Edwards clearly teaches that men are the subjects of *a natural or native depravity*. This will be admitted on all hands. But it is important to ascertain what this writer

means by that depravity which he thus describes.

He introduces the subject of his treatise in the form of this general proposition:

"Mankind are all naturally in such a state, as is attended, without fail, with this consequence or issue; that they universally run themselves into that which is in effect their own utter eternal perdition, as being finally accursed of God and the subjects of his remediless wrath through sin." Works, Vol. VI. p 137.

On the same page, he more fully unfolds the meaning of this proposition.

"In order to demonstrate what is asserted in the proposition laid down, there is need only that these two things be made manifest; *one* is this fact, that all mankind come into the world in such a state, as without fail comes to this issue, namely, the universal commission of sin; or that every one who comes to act in the world as a moral agent, is in a greater or less degree guilty of sin. The other is, that all sin deserves and exposes to utter and eternal destruction, &c."

Now I ask whether this general proposition, or the explanation given of it, teaches the doctrine of physical depravity? To say that mankind are naturally in such a state that *they will run themselves into sin*, or to say that their state in this world will result in the universal *commission of sin*, or to say that every one who comes to act in the world as a moral agent, is guilty of sin, is not asserting that sin is a con-created substantial attribute of human nature. On the contrary the language unambiguously asserts that sin in man is the voluntary act of man as a moral agent, and of course amounts to an explicit denial of the doctrine charged.

In the next paragraph in which Edwards proceeds to support his general proposition by argument, he expressly excludes from it the idea, that men come guilty into the world. He says, stating what he undertakes to prove, "that every one of mankind, at least of them that are capable of acting as moral

agents are guilty of sin, (not now taking it for granted that they come guilty into the world) is a thing most clearly and abundantly evident from the holy scriptures." Unless then we suppose Edwards to include more in his proposition, than he professes to prove by his argument, it is plain that he does not intend to assert in his proposition, the doctrine of physical depravity; for he expressly disclaims the attempt to prove in this section that mankind are *guilty* at all, at their first existence. And yet strange as it may appear, this general proposition of Edwards is especially relied on to support the charge of physical depravity.

From his general proposition, Edwards proceeds in the second section to derive the following inference:

"That all mankind are under the influence of a prevailing effectual tendency in their nature, to that sin and wickedness which implies their utter and eternal ruin." p. 144.

This tendency he also calls "*propensity, disposition, proneness, &c.*" The question then is, does Edwards mean by this *tendency, propensity, disposition, &c.* a substantial property of our nature which is *in itself* sinful and deserving of punishment? This question divides itself into two, viz. does he mean by this *tendency, propensity, &c.* a substantial attribute or property of our nature, and if so, does he teach that this property or attribute is *in itself* sinful and deserving of punishment? Confining my present remarks to the first of these enquiries, I answer in the negative and allege,

First his definition of tendency.

"Let it be considered what can be meant by tendency but a prevailing liableness or exposedness to such or such an event. Wherein consists the notion of any such thing, but some stated prevalence or preponderation in the nature or state of causes or *occasions* that is followed *by* or is effectual *to*, a stated prevalence or commonness of any particular kind of effect? or something in the

permanent state of things, concerned in bringing a certain sort of event to pass, which is a foundation for the constancy or strong prevailing probability of such an event. If we mean this by tendency (as I know not what else can be meant by it but this, or something like this,) then it is manifest that where we see a prevalence of any kind of effect or event, there is a tendency to that effect in the nature and state of its causes." p. 145.

Now I ask, may there not be a tendency or propensity to sin according to the above definition of the term, which is not a substantial attribute of human nature? May there not be that in the nature or *state* of causes, or *occasions*, which is *followed by* sin; or something *concerned* in bringing sin to pass, which is the foundation of its constancy or strong prevailing probability, but which is still not an essential attribute of man's nature? May not the *strength* of those appetites and passions which were in man in innocence be such, or may not the *power* of temptation be such, or may not both be such, that the result will be a prevailing liableness or exposedness to sin?—But a tendency or propensity to sin thus resulting, would not be a created substantial attribute of man's nature. And yet such a tendency comes up fully to Edwards's definition of that term.

Secondly: That Edwards does not mean by tendency, propensity, &c. a substantial attribute of our nature, appears from his argument *ex concessis* on this point. Quoting from Dr. Taylor certain passages in which the latter concedes that we are very apt in a world full of temptation to be drawn into sin, and that our case under mere law is by consequence hopeless as to an escape from death, Edwards says, "these things amount to a full confession that the proneness in men to sin, &c. is the highest kind of tendency or propensity." Alluding then to an intimation of Dr. Taylor 'that propensity may result from defect rather than any thing posi-

tive" he says, "it is agreeable to the sentiments of the best divines, that all sin originally comes from a defective or privative cause; and 'that a propensity to sin does not cease to be a propensity to sin, because it arises from such a cause' pp. 147—149. But how could Edwards maintain that the proneness to sin conceded by Dr. Taylor, amounts to the highest kind of tendency, and admit that it arises from a *privative* cause, and yet maintain that it is a positive existence,—a *created* substantial attribute of man's nature?

Thirdly, I argue the same thing from Edwards's reply to those who say that this tendency to sin does not lie in man's nature, but in his external circumstances, as surrounded by many and strong temptations. He says: "To this I would reply, that such an evasion will not at all avail to the purpose of those whom I oppose in this controversy. It alters not the case as to this question, whether man is not a creature that in his present state is depraved and ruined by propensities to sin. If any creature be of such a nature that it proves evil in its proper place, or in the situation which God has assigned it in the universe, it is of an evil nature. That part of the system is not good, which is not good in its place in the system; and those inherent qualities of that part of the system, which are not good, but corrupt, in that place, are justly looked upon as evil inherent qualities. That propensity is truly esteemed to belong to the *nature* of any being, or to be inherent in it, that is the necessary consequence of its nature, considered together with its proper situation in the universal system of existence, whether that propensity be good or bad. It is the *nature* of a stone to be heavy; but yet, if it were placed, as it might be, at a distance from this world, it would have no such quality. But seeing a stone is of such a nature, that it will have this quality or tendency, in its proper place, here in

this world, where God has made it, it is properly looked upon as a propensity belonging to its nature: And if it be a good propensity here in its proper place, then it is a good quality of its nature; but if it be contrariwise, it is an evil natural quality. So, if mankind are of such a nature, that they have an universal, effectual tendency to sin and ruin in this world where God has made and placed them, this is to be looked upon as a pernicious tendency belonging to their nature. There is, perhaps, scarce any such thing in beings not independent and self-existent, as any power or tendency, but what has some dependence on other beings, which they stand in some connexion with, in the universal system of existence: Propensities are no propensities, any other-wise, than as taken with their objects. Thus it is with the tendencies observed in natural bodies, such as gravity, magnetism, electricity, &c. And thus it is with the propensities observed in the various kinds of animals; and thus it is with most of the propensities in created spirits." pp. 150, 151.

The above objection, Edwards does not answer by saying that it asserts that which is false, but by showing that it amounts to the same thing which he maintains. He says "it alters not the case," i. e. the fact is the same; man in his present state is depraved and ruined by propensities to sin whether we say this tendency to sin arises from his external circumstances, or belongs to the nature of man. What he contends for is the propriety of assuming a thing to be in its proper place in the universe, when speaking of its nature; a point of verbal accuracy which cannot admit of much debate. It is then perfectly consistent with his notion of tendency to sin, that it should depend on man's external circumstances, and wholly cease by a change in these circumstances. But how could he admit this, and yet maintain this tendency to be a sub-

substantial attribute of man's nature independent of all circumstances?

But it may be asked, why then does Edwards speak of this tendency to sin as "inherent in and seated in that nature which is common to all mankind?" I answer that this language with the meaning now given, is fully authorized by usage. Nothing is more common, as in the example of the stone given by Edwards, than to speak of a thing as having in its nature a given tendency, although a change of circumstances would change its tendency, without any change in its nature. But whether usage authorizes this meaning of the term or not, Edwards has explicitly told us, that such is *his* meaning. "That propensity is truly esteemed to belong to the nature of any being, or to be *inherent* in it, that is the necessary *consequence* of its nature, considered together with its proper situation in the universal system of existence." Tendency then, according to this writer is not identical with the nature of a thing or any essential part of that nature, but a *consequence* of its nature, considered in its proper place in the system of existence. Nothing therefore appears thus far, inconsistent with the opinion, that the tendency to sin in man results from the innocent appetites and passions of his nature, in the circumstances in which he is placed—nothing of course like the doctrine that a propensity or tendency to sin belongs to human nature as a substantial property or attribute.

It ought here to be remarked, that while this view of Edwards's idea of tendency, if it be just, decides that he did not hold the doctrine of physical depravity, still if it be not just, it will not prove that he did hold this doctrine. For should it be conceded that this propensity, tendency, &c. is according to Edwards, a substantial attribute of our nature, it will not follow that he considered it as in itself sinful and deserving of punishment. More of this under my next remark.

2. Edwards maintains that the

natural depravity of mankind is a *moral* depravity. He says, "and then it must be remembered that it is a *moral* depravity, we are speaking of." He calls the same thing a *corrupt tendency, a sinful depraved propensity, a depraved, sinful, vicious disposition*. And here perhaps the reader will imagine that I concede the very thing, which I have before denied, viz. that this tendency, propensity, or disposition is according to Edwards, sinful *in itself* and deserving of punishment. But there are some things to be considered before this conclusion can be warranted. First, the terms tendency, propensity, and disposition, have different meanings in different applications. They are often applied both to voluntary and to involuntary states of the mind. When in connexion with the epithet sinful they are known to be applied to voluntary states of the mind, the nature of the subject requires us to understand that which is *in itself* sinful and deserving of punishment; as when we speak of a sinful, avaricious, gluttonous, or ambitious, propensity or disposition. But these terms are also applied to involuntary states of the mind, to which strictly speaking no moral quality belongs; as when we speak of a propensity or disposition in respect to any object, in distinction from the choice of that object, or as subdued and governed by considerations of duty. A late writer says, "in the sense in which I understand the word, the essence of sin does not consist in propensity, inclination or disposition to sin, but in yielding to that propensity." Now all I intend by these remarks is, that the mere terms *propensity, disposition, &c.* as used by Edwards do not decide that he means that which is *in itself* sinful and deserving of punishment.—Secondly, the epithets connected with these terms by our author, such as *moral, evil, bad, pernicious, sinful, &c.* have also different meanings in different applications. When we apply these terms to known voluntary acts, we mean and are

properly understood to mean, that they are *in themselves* moral, evil, or sinful, and deserving of punishment. The nature of the subject shows that such is our meaning. But we also apply these several terms with a different meaning, naming the cause from the effect which it tends to produce. Thus we speak of a *moral law*, a *moral tendency*, or a *moral influence*, meaning simply that which tends to produce *moral* results. In like manner we frequently use the words *good* and *evil*, to designate that which *produces* good or evil. So the word *sinful* is often applied, as when we speak of *sinful objects*, the *sinful tendency* of objects, *sinful motives*, meaning objects which tend to produce sin. Nothing is more common than this use of these terms, and therefore the mere terms furnish no evidence, that they are not thus used by Edwards. Indeed on the supposition that by natural depravity this author means that derangement or deterioration either in the constitution or in the circumstances of man, or in both, which results in a tendency to certain sin, it would be perfectly proper and natural phraseology, to speak of such depravity as a *moral depravity*, meaning that it tends to moral results; and of the tendency to sin as an *evil* or *sinful tendency*, meaning that it terminates in moral evil or sin.

Thirdly, to remove all doubt on this point, Edwards has most accurately and fully defined the terms in question, and told us in what sense he uses them. He says,

"And then it must be remembered that it is a *moral depravity*, we are speaking of; and therefore when we are considering whether such a depravity do not appear by a bad effect or issue, it is a *moral tendency to such an issue that is to be taken into the account*. A moral tendency or influence is by *desert*. Then it may be said, man's nature or state is attended with a pernicious or destructive tendency in a *moral sense* when it tends TO THAT WHICH deserves misery and destruction." p. 133.

Here then we have an unambiguous, precise explanation of the sense

in which Edwards applies the word *moral* to the natural depravity of man. It is a *moral depravity* as the nature of man is attended with a tendency TO THAT WHICH deserves misery and destruction. Is this asserting, or is it virtually denying the natural depravity of man to be moral *in itself* and deserving of punishment?—Did only this single explanation of the term occur in the treatise of Edwards, it would be enough to oblige every reader to limit the term *moral* and its kindred terms in the instances under consideration, to *that which tends to moral effects*. But Edwards has not left the matter here. In the third section, he comes to show that "that propensity which has been proved to be in the nature of all mankind must be a *very evil, depraved, and pernicious propensity, &c.*" And to prevent as it would seem, the very misapprehension which I am considering, he says,

"A propensity to that sin which brings God's eternal wrath and curse (which has been proved to belong to the nature of man) is evil, not only as it is *calamitous and sorrowful*, ending in great *natural evil*, but as it is *odious and detestable*: For by the supposition, it tends to that *moral evil*, by which the subject becomes odious in the sight of God, and liable, as such, to be condemned, and utterly rejected, and cursed by him. This also makes it evident, that the state which it has been proved mankind are in, is a corrupt state in a *moral sense*, that it is inconsistent with the fulfilment of the law of God, which is the rule of moral rectitude and goodness. That tendency which is opposite to that which the moral law requires and insists upon, and prone to that which the moral law utterly forbids, and eternally condemns the subject for, is doubtless a corrupt tendency, in a moral sense." p. 154.

Now I ask, why according to Edwards, is "a propensity which brings God's eternal wrath and curse, evil?" Not merely because it ends in great natural evil;—nor yet does he say that it is in itself, *moral evil*;—but that it is evil, because it TENDS TO MORAL EVIL. It is a tendency, he does not say, *which* the moral law forbids, but he says, it is a

tendency "opposite to *that which* the moral law requires and prone to *that which* the moral law forbids." And this he says is a corrupt tendency in a moral sense. Language could scarcely be more explicit, in excluding the idea, that the propensity to sin of which the writer speaks, is *in itself* sinful and deserving of punishment, and in confining his meaning to the single idea that this propensity is evil or sinful as it *tends* to moral evil or sin. Have we then a right to say that Edwards does mean by the terms in question, what he so plainly says he does *not* mean? Have we a right to give them a meaning beyond that to which he so absolutely confines them? If not, then the point is decided, that when he speaks of the tendency, propensity, &c. of our nature as evil, sinful, pernicious, &c. he adopts the very common principle of language, viz. of naming the cause from the effect; and means simply that it is evil or sinful as *it tends to moral evil or sin*. —Indeed it must be obvious to every candid reader of his treatise that these definitions and careful and accurate distinctions, were made for the very purpose of guarding against the imputation of what is now termed physical depravity.

3. Edwards maintains that man in the state *in which he comes into the world is sinful and justly exposed to divine wrath*. Speaking of the deplorable undone state of man by nature, as a state which tends to certain sin and ruin, he says, "and this proves that men do not come into the world perfectly innocent in the sight of God, and without any just exposedness to his displeasure." p. 155. He goes even further than this, and speaks of "the guilt arising from the first existing of a depraved disposition." p. 438. In this and similar language of his work, lies I apprehend the principal ground of the misapprehensions of this writer. Some of his readers, less careful than they should be, by overlooking his

peculiar views respecting the imputation of Adam's sin, have been unable to put any other meaning upon some of his phraseology than that which exhibits man as personally guilty at his first existence. Now to the real meaning of this phraseology of Edwards, if I mistake not, the key can be found only in his views of imputation. While then it is undeniable that he maintains that guilt and desert of punishment pertain to man and even to his depraved disposition on his first existence, still the question is, in what does this guilt consist according to this writer? Concerning the true answer to this enquiry, he has left us at no loss. For he most unequivocally and abundantly affirms that the guilt and the *only* guilt which belongs to man on his first existence, is the *imputed guilt* of Adam's sin. The following extracts will show the views of Edwards on this point.

"I think, it would go far towards directing us to the more clear and distinct conceiving and right stating of this affair, were we steadily to bear this in mind: That God, in each step of his proceeding with Adam, in relation to the covenant or constitution established with him, looked on his posterity as being *one with him*. (The propriety of his looking upon them so, I shall speak to afterwards.) And though he dealt more immediately with Adam, yet it was as the *head* of the whole body, and the *root* of the whole tree; and in his proceedings with him, he dealt with all the branches, as if they had been then existing in their root.

From which it will follow, that both guilt, or exposedness to punishment, and also depravity of heart, came upon Adam's posterity just as they came upon him, as much as if he and they had all co-existed, like a tree with many branches; allowing only for the difference necessarily resulting from the place Adam stood in, as head or root of the whole, and being first and most immediately dealt with, and most immediately acting and suffering. Otherwise, it is as if, in every step of proceeding, every alteration in the root had been attended, at the same instant, with the same steps and alterations throughout the whole tree, in each individual branch. I think this will naturally follow on the supposition of there being a constituted *oneness or identity* of Adam and his posterity in this affair.

Therefore I am humbly of opinion, that if any have supposed the children of Adam to come into the world with a *double guilt*, one the guilt of Adam's sin, another the guilt arising from their having a corrupt heart, they have not so well conceived of the matter. The *guilt* a man has upon his soul at his first existence, is one and simple, viz. the guilt of the original apostacy, the guilt of the sin by which the species first rebelled against God. This, and the guilt arising from the first corruption or depraved disposition of the heart, are not to be looked upon as *two things, distinctly* imputed and charged upon men in the sight of God. Indeed the guilt that arises from the corruption of the heart, as it remains a confirmed principle, and appears in its consequent operations, is a *distinct and additional* guilt: But the guilt arising from the first existing of a depraved disposition in Adam's posterity, I apprehend, is *not* distinct from their guilt of Adam's first sin." p. 437, 438.

"And in like manner, depravity of heart is to be considered two ways in Adam's posterity. The *first existing* of a corrupt disposition in their hearts, is not to be looked upon as sin belonging to them, *distinct* from their participation of Adam's first sin: It is as it were the *extended pollution* of that sin, through the whole tree, by virtue of the constituted *union* of the branches with the root; or the *inherence* of the sin of that head of the species in the members, in the consent and concurrence of the hearts of the members with the head in that first act." p. 438.

"Not excepting even *infants*, who could be sinners no other way than by virtue of Adam's transgression, having never in their own persons actually sinned as Adam did. p. 396.

"The *imputation* of Adam's one transgression, is indeed most directly and frequently asserted. We are here assured that *by one man's sin, death passed on all*; all being adjudged to this punishment, as having *sinned* (so it is implied) in that one man's sin. And it is repeated over and over, that *all are condemned, many are dead, many made sinners, &c.* by *one man's offence, by the disobedience of one, and by one offence*. And the doctrine of original depravity is also here taught, when the apostle says, *By one man sin entered into the world*; having a plain respect (as hath been shewn) to that universal corruption and wickedness, as well as guilt, which he had before largely treated of." p. 400.

"Though the word, *impute*, is not used with respect to Adam's sin, yet it is said, *All have sinned*; which, respecting infants, can be true only of their sinning by

his sin. And, it is said, *By his disobedience many were made sinners*; and, *Judgment and condemnation came upon all by that sin*; and that, by this means, *death [the wages of sin] passed on all men, &c.*" p. 474.

"Surely it is no wonder that they (infants) be not guilty of *positive* wicked action, before they are capable of any *moral* action at all." p. 475.

Here then our author, maintaining the personal identity, according to divine constitution, of Adam and his posterity, declares that men do not come into the world with a *double* guilt, one the guilt of Adam's sin, and the other the guilt of having a corrupt heart; that the guilt which a man has upon his soul at his first existence, is *one and simple*, viz. the guilt of the original apostacy; that the inspired declaration, *all have sinned*, in respect to infants can be true *only* of their sinning by Adam's sin; that infants can be sinners in no other way but by Adam's transgression; and that they are not capable of any moral action at all. But how could Edwards without falling into an inconsistency too gross to be imputed to him, maintain that the *only* guilt which belongs to man when he comes into the world is the imputed guilt of Adam's sin, and yet maintain that he is the subject of a natural propensity which is *in itself* sinful and deserving of punishment?

4. Edwards unequivocally *denies* that any such property or attribute as the doctrine of physical depravity asserts, belongs to the nature of man. This he does, when he asserts that the *only* guilt which belongs to man on his first existence, is the imputed guilt of Adam's sin. But what makes it still more strange that any reader of his treatise should ascribe such a doctrine to Edwards is, that he has formally and explicitly stated it as an objection to his doctrine, and denied that it either belongs to his doctrine, or can be inferred from it. Nor is this all. He is very explicit in unfolding his views of what the propensity or tendency to sin in man is:

and whence it arises ; and in this way, showing that it is not and cannot be a physical attribute of human nature. Thus he says :

"One argument against men's being supposed to be born with sinful depravity, which Dr. Taylor greatly insists upon, is 'That this does in effect charge him, who is the *author of our nature, who formed us in the womb*, with being the *author of a sinful corruption of nature* ; and that it is *highly injurious* to the God of our nature, whose hands have formed and fashioned us, to believe our nature to be *originally corrupted*, and that in the worst sense of corruption.'"

With respect to this, I would observe in the first place, that this writer, in his handling this grand objection, supposes something to belong to the doctrine objected against, as maintained by the divines whom he is opposing, which does not belong to it, nor does follow from it: As particularly, he supposes the doctrine of Original Sin to imply, that nature must be corrupted by some *positive influence* ; "something, by some means or other, *infused* into the human nature ; some *quality* or other, not from the *choice* of our minds, but like a *taint, tincture, or infection*, altering the natural constitution, faculties, and dispositions of our souls. That sin and evil dispositions are *implanted* in the *fœtus* in the womb." Whereas truly our doctrine neither implies nor infers any such thing. In order to account for a sinful corruption of nature, yea, a total native depravity of the heart of man, there is not the least need of supposing any evil quality, *infused, implanted, or wrought* into the nature of man, by any *positive* cause, or influence whatsoever, either from God, or the creature ; or of supposing, that man is conceived and born with a *fountain of evil* in his heart, such as is any thing properly *positive*. I think, a little attention to the nature of things will be sufficient to satisfy any impartial, considerate inquirer, that the absence of positive good principles, and so the withholding of a special divine influence to impart and maintain those good principles, leaving the common natural principles of self-love, natural appetite, &c. (which were in man in innocence) leaving these, I say, to themselves, without the government of superior divine principles, will certainly be followed with the corruption, yea, the total corruption of the heart, without occasion for any positive influence at all : And, that it was thus indeed that corruption of nature came on Adam, immediately on his fall, and comes on all his posterity, as sinning in him, and falling with him." pp. 427, 428.

It is undeniable that the doctrine of physical depravity is no new invention. It was the *grand objection* against the doctrine of original sin, to say the least as early as the times of Taylor and Edwards. It was formally and explicitly alleged by the one as constituting the very doctrine of the orthodox, and as formally and explicitly denied by the other as belonging to this doctrine or following from it.—He further affirms that our nature is not corrupted by any positive influence ; that no such quality as is here supposed, which is not from the *choice* of our minds, pertains to the soul ; that the *natural constitution, faculties and dispositions* of the soul are not *altered* by any such infections ; that *no evil quality* is infused, implanted or wrought into the *nature of man* by any positive cause or influence whatsoever from God or the creature ; and that man is not born with a fountain of evil in his heart such as is any thing properly *positive*. Now if this is not a denial, that man is created with a substantial property or attribute of his nature which is *in itself* sinful, as direct and explicit as language can furnish, I know not how such denial can be made.

Let us now advert to the manner in which Edwards supposes the heart of man comes to be corrupt. Is it by man's being created with a substantial property of his nature which is *in itself* sinful ? Let Edwards answer. "Leaving the common natural principles of self-love and natural appetite, &c. (which were in man in innocence) leaving these I say, to themselves, without the government of superior divine principles, *will certainly be followed with the total corruption of the heart*."—Now I ask, where is the sinful created attribute of our nature ? Does it consist in self-love, natural appetite, &c. But these, says Edwards were in man in innocence. Is the corruption of the heart itself, a created attribute of our nature ? But

this corruption of heart is consequent upon, or *follows* our created nature with its attributes ; for our nature with its attributes is presupposed as the origin or source of this corruption. How then can the corruption of heart itself, according to this writer be a substantial attribute of human nature ?

I might adduce more copious extracts from Edwards on the point now under consideration. Requesting the reader to examine the second chapter of the fourth part of Edwards's treatise, I will simply submit the following as an epitomized view of Edwards's theory respecting the origin of sin :

Man being left, as he justly might be on the ground of the apostacy of our race in Adam, without the preventing influence of God, his nature is such in the circumstances in which he is placed, that although he is bound to subordinate the gratification of those natural appetites and passions which are in themselves neither sinful nor holy, to the will and glory of God, he does prefer such gratification, and fix his heart upon it as his chief good ; and that he does this with such a strength of disposition and purpose, that he is sure, though against the will of God, to abide by this preference of worldly good ; and that thus his heart being completely under the dominion of these objects of private gratification, i. e. supremely selfish is in fact a heart of opposition to God and to his glory. Vid. pp. 427.—432.

According to this view of Edwards's theory, the direct source of the cor-

ruption of the heart lies in that self-love and those natural appetites and passions which were in man in innocence. I will not say that this is a scriptural, common-sense account of the matter, nor that it is one which tells in the universal consciousness of men, nor that men know as well why they sin as why they eat and drink ; but I cannot hesitate to affirm that here is not the remotest semblance of the doctrine of physical depravity.

To conclude, if any are not satisfied that the account which has now been given of Edwards's views of Original Sin, is correct, I earnestly request them to show wherein it is incorrect. The way to do this, is not to quote insulated passages from his work, and to interpret them with a meaning which they will *possibly* bear. But it must be shewn that they will not bear, according to usage, the meaning which I have given them, and especially that the definitions and explanations of Edwards, do not require that his language be interpreted with this meaning.—I wish to add, that it is no part of my design in this paper to enquire what is or what is not, orthodoxy properly so called in respect to the origin of sin in man, or in respect to the moral state of infants. They who dissent from Edwards on either or on both of these points, must sustain their claim to orthodoxy as they can. The simple question is, what does Edwards teach on these points, be its bearing on modern orthodoxy, what it may.

T. R.

Miscellaneous.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.

WHILE others are content with the mere hearing of events and pay no regard to their effects upon public happiness or virtue, it becomes the Christian moralist to move in a high-

er sphere of thought, to trace occurrences to their causes and effects or to connect them with each other. For if in this way he can discover the wisdom of God the governor of nations, or can originate some plan to increase the good or prevent the

evil of society, he will not think that he has reflected in vain.

Will you indulge me with a place in your periodical while I *start* a few thoughts of this kind, occasioned as you may have already conjectured, by the arrival of our illustrious friend La Fayette. He came to gratify his own feelings and to comply with our requests. But while influenced by these considerations so laudable, he has produced good effects which he little thought of. One spirit is excited through the country which while it centres in gratitude towards him, reverts to the scenes of the revolution as the cause of this gratitude. Then, after seven years of suffering—after taxes had impoverished the country, and battle had cut down its best defenders, peace and independence, and rational liberty dawned upon us. Now we are a nation extending over an immense territory differing in interests and feelings, and unable by our situation to have that strong bond of national feeling which surrounding rivals create in the kingdoms of Europe. But by this event we are impressed with reflections which will create among the portions of our country, if not so strong, at least a more genuine attachment than that created by the pressure of rivals upon us. What patriot of '76 did not love his native land better for the thought that it was struggling to be free. He felt himself a part of the country, for he was acting with it and for it. He had united his interests with hers, so that they were to fall or stand together. If she had been enslaved he would have wept over her, but yet loved her the more tenderly for her unsuccessful struggles to be free. In her *success* he loved her and his memory esteemed those hours of generous hazard when he could dare something worthy of man—those hours of adversity when he felt ready to devote them to death for his country, the most pleasant of his life. For the pleasure of possessing the higher feelings of the soul is a reward

for whatever exertions they prompt us to make. And so high a devotion to their country was excited by the events of the revolution in the patriot of those days, that what would be sacrilege and treason to him, appears to his descendants mere indifference to his welfare. The same feelings are kindled in our bosoms by the vivid impressions which this visit will make. We love each other the better for paying unanimous respect to La Fayette. We feel like the children of one family, for our fathers were engaged in one struggle for liberty. It is as if Washington had arisen from his grave, and was going through the land with those impressive lessons on his lips which he has embodied in his farewell address.

But is there not danger that too high admiration of military glory will be excited by these late events? Will not the young men of our country, seeing a conqueror before them, long after the same distinction? But they should consider that it is not his valour which the nation admires: it is his benefits and kindness towards us. They should learn—(and surely it is too obvious to escape their notice) how much nobler it is to excite gratitude than cold admiration, and that men of talents can never gain the affections of their fellow-men unless they do some good to society. They must disdain the spirit of petty state-politics; they must not condescend to be the subordinates of any politician however he can reward them. They must not listen to the cry of local interest when the interests of the whole country would be prejudiced by it; they must despise that avarice which keeps back the public money from every thing great and good, and that popularity which is gained by echoing back opinions which no man of sense or integrity can entertain; in short they must be disinterested and large-minded, and they too will receive the admiration and gratitude of the best part of their countrymen.

This brings to my mind the affec-

tion which has followed Washington's memory, and hence I am led to notice the goodness of God in keeping and sustaining and forming him for the scenes he went through. Few nations perhaps have had their destinies placed in the hands of one man so completely as ours was in his. Perhaps no other man before the public could have filled his place. But he was preserved through numberless dangers until our liberties were secured and these dangers themselves gave him that combination of self-reliance, perseverance, forecast and reserve which the world has seen in no other man. Had he not been a man of integrity, all would have been lost, for his interests were not so closely connected with the contest but that by treachery or sudden resignation he might have thrown all into confusion. If ambition had been his ruling passion, there was ample occasion to gratify it by supreme power after he had no competitor in Great Britain, and few men could have resisted their desire to usurp power at such a time, however the fate of former tyrants might have warned them. But he declined the power which the free vote of his country would have invested him with, that he might set an example to his successors of its moderate enjoyment. How seldom is political sagacity joined in one man with military talents, but he by his measures and principles has laid down maxims which the country has never followed without prospering, and has never gone wrong in her affairs but when she departed from them. How good then has the Governor of nations been in forming him for very unusual circumstances long before they existed, in calling him to his place when his qualifications were not fully known, in saving him from guilty enterprises, in endowing him with political wisdom, in making him a model of private, and a warm friend of public virtue, in showing by him to his country the rewards of disinterestedness.

Happy would it be for our country if all her rulers had the same regard for public virtue, and were as safe examples to be followed, as WASHINGTON. The character of the nation would at once be raised, and the honor of being a ruler increased. But the Christian moralist is compelled to observe some of them acting as if they were above the laws of man and of God. Every person in authority cannot but be struck with the importance of the Sabbath in a political point of view, and must therefore perceive his duty to observe it. How much then it ought to surprise us, that a few weeks since one hundred men were employed throughout the Sabbath in decorating the room where a fete was to be given in honour of La Fayette. No reason can excuse this violation of the Sabbath, sanctioned as it was by the military and civil authorities and indeed committed by their direction. Mr. Editor, others may excuse this—although I think the better feelings of our countrymen will generally condemn it, but you must be of the opinion that the country ought to be ashamed of those who authorized this proceeding, and that they ought to blush for themselves.

EUPORIUS.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator,

I notice in the papers that the second Monday evening in each month is recommended to be set apart as *a monthly concert of prayer*, for Sabbath Schools. On looking into the August and September numbers of the American Sunday School Magazine, I find that the proposal originated in a meeting of Male Teachers in Philadelphia; or rather in a "hint on the subject from a Vice President of the American Sunday School Union." The reasoning with which the proposal is brought before the public is summarily this; that the Sunday School system is "a great and extended interest,"

numbering "ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND TEACHERS," and demanding "the *stated* and *united* prayers of Christians in all parts of the world;" that prayer in general, and *concert prayer* in particular, is essential to the success of every Christian enterprise;—that the existing monthly concert has an exclusive reference to *missions*, and should not be diverted from this specific object; and hence, finally, that it is proper to establish a monthly concert for Sabbath Schools.

Now, Mr. Editor, I wish to suggest whether this sort of reasoning may not be turned to some further account, and whether the "hint" which occasioned it, may not be made profitable to various other great concerns. I would ask the managers of *Bible Societies* whether *theirs* be not "a great and extended interest" embracing thousands of auxiliaries and tens of thousands of contributors, and whether a monthly concert be not as important to their cause as to that of Sunday Schools. Inasmuch therefore, as Bible Societies are not identified with 'missions' and consequently do not come within the view of the existing monthly concert, is it not plainly the duty of those who direct them to recommend that some evening in each month be set apart as *a concert of prayer for Bible Societies*?

Again: the "cause of religion among seamen" is "a great and extended interest." Are there not a "hundred thousand" of these neglected men for whom "Christians in all parts of the world" have never prayed in concert? Ought there not therefore to be *a monthly concert for Seamen*? Further: Education Societies, Tract Societies, Jews' Societies, our Colleges, and many other things of which time would fail me to speak, are among those great and extended interests against which the monthly concert for *missions* has shut its doors. But whereunto will this matter grow? "On such an evening"—I seem to

hear our ministers proclaiming from the desk—"On such an evening of the present week is the monthly concert for *missions*,—and on such an evening is the Sunday School Monthly Concert,—and on such an evening is the Seamen's, or the Jews', or the Bible, or the Education, or the Colonization Society's monthly concert!" Monthly concerts thicken upon us till they outnumber the feasts and fasts of the Catholic Church, and we need our rosaries to keep our reckoning.

In objects of public importance a man's sensible horizon is the line which circumscribes his own labors. By confining his views and his efforts to some one department in the great field of Christian benevolence, he is apt to overlook the importance of other departments and to conclude that his own enterprise is the great enterprise of the age. He surveys the magnitude of the operations which it contemplates and reckons up the thousands that are interested in it, and for it, till in his view it is nothing less than the stone cut out without hands, which became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. I love the zeal which carries with it the whole heart; but let it be tempered by knowledge and by catholic views. To whatever division of the great army of the Prince of Peace we may have attached ourselves let us be faithful to our post; but let us look beyond our own operations and consider how our particular plans and movements are likely to tally with the general object of the campaign. My objection to the proposed monthly concert is the very obvious one, that it will do away the interest of that already established. The existing monthly concert is a most interesting and sacred institution. It is interesting in its nature and in the associations with which its history is connected. But, it is confined, we are told, to *missions*, and "ought not to be diverted from this specific purpose." How it may have been conducted in some places

I cannot tell, but wherever it has been my happiness to be present, it has embraced not simply missions, but *all* the interests of Christ's kingdom, and all the means of its advancement. Its simple prayer is, Thy kingdom come; and the communication of no species of intelligence relating to that kingdom, nor the mention of any one great subject of prayer or praise, however distinct from missions, has been considered inappropriate to the occasion. Missions it is true hold a prominent place in the exercises of the monthly concert: and this is as it should be; for they hold a prominent place in the great system of means for converting the world. But it is with some surprise I learn, that those who have not been accustomed to restrict it to missions, have mistaken its character and celebrated it amiss.

One monthly concert is important. It is well that there should be one such season returning monthly to remind Christians in all lands of their common relation to the great family of Christ, and of their common duty to the millions of them that dwell in darkness. But add another, and another to it, and the peculiar sacredness of the institution is gone.

I have not troubled you, Mr. Editor, with these remarks, because I have any apprehension that the observance of the new monthly concert will become universal, even among teachers themselves. Yet it may. The resolution of the "Association of Male Teachers" in Philadelphia, is seconded by the formal and imposing recommendation of the "Board of Managers of the American Sunday School Union;" and "the first Sunday School Monthly Concert" has already been attended in several of our large cities.

Finally; if my views on this subject be erroneous, I shall be sorry to have burthened your pages with them. But if they be right I shall not be alone in my regret, that a measure of so much importance as the one under consideration, should

have been adopted without due consideration and sufficiently extensive views—a measure which is to affect existing institutions and habits, and which, if the hand of time do not write *Ichabod* both upon it and the sister institution, is to go down to the evening of the millennium.

A Sabbath School Teacher.

For the Christian Spectator.

STANZAS,

Written in the Album of a Lady who had suggested her "WORK-BASKET" as a theme for a poet.

I saw it in a midnight dream,
When slumber's charm was o'er me:—
A little basket in the beam
Of noon-day stood before me;—
Its beauty was exceeding rare,
And yet 'twas no less frail than fair.

2

So fair,—it seem'd some elfin band
From Fairy-land had brought it;
So frail,—it seem'd some fairy hand,
Of gossamer had wrought it:
Its lid was down, 'twas fill'd with flowers
Gather'd from Flora's choicest bowers.

3

Yet thro' its sides, in every part,
Their sweet perfume was stealing;
'Twas like a guileless maiden's heart
Its inmost thoughts revealing:
And soon, methought a singing maid
Was sitting there, those flow'rs to braid.

4

As grew, like hope, the flow'ry wreath
Beneath her flying fingers,
She seem'd with half a sigh to breathe—
"How long the moment lingers."
Thus as I saw, methought decay
Came o'er me,—and I pass'd away.

5

The blast of death had o'er me swept,
Ere yet that wreath was braided;
And in the silent grave I slept,
Before those flow'rs were faded;—
And soon above my ashes grew
The mournful cypress, and the yew.

6

I dream'd that when a few brief years
Were past, my parted spirit
Came back to trace the joys and fears
That once it did inherit;—
Just as the man comes back to trace
The scenes of childhood's dwelling-place.

7

I saw that little basket stand
In all its fairy lightness
Ev'n as before;—but time's rude hand
Had dimm'd its snowy whiteness,

And now among its flow'rs was seen
Full many a dark sad evergreen.

8

But where was she?—
* * * *

9

————— I seem'd to hear
An unseen spirit singing ;
I woke, but in my listening ear
The music still was ringing;—
“ The lightest, frailest things we see
Are not so light and frail as we.”

L. L.

Review of New Publications.

1. *The Decision : or Religion must be All, or is Nothing.* Second American Edition, enlarged. 12mo. pp. 108. Boston, 1823.
2. *Profession is not Principle : or the Name of Christian is not Christianity.* By the Author of “ *The Decision*.” pp. 162. 12mo. Boston, 1824.

It is not among the least of the wonders of modern times, that every species of intellectual effort should be enlisted in the service of religion. Nay, even a great deal of worldly business seems to be shaped and modified under its influence. Men seem to lay their plans with some sort of reference to religion. There is probably no surer index of the current of fashion, than the periodical advertisements of “ *New Publications*.” Those enterprising men, the Booksellers, are too sharp sighted not to follow where public opinion leads. They have no idea of publishing such kind of books as will not be interesting, and which, of course, *will not sell*. And that other very useful class of persons, the *Book makers*, as a body, are always sufficiently dependent, to fall very readily into the popular current. When therefore, we find all sorts of publications devoted to the subject of religion, Novels, Tales, and Children's Books ; Geographies, Gazetteers, and School Books ; Newspapers, Magazines, and Almanacks ; and the number of these continually increasing, as if laboring to meet the pressing demand ; we may be sure that religion of some sort, has be-

come, as it ought to be, the paramount subject of interest in the community.

The effect has been, as we believe, that a taste for reading is much more generally diffused, and a consequent enlargement of mind has taken place, beyond any thing that was ever known before. If knowledge is power, then there is, at this present time, a much greater amount of moral force than there ever was before, which is ready to act, with an unexampled efficiency, either to subserve, or to injure, the best interests of man. Exactly proportioned, therefore, to the amount of intelligence diffused, becomes the importance of having the public mind decidedly biassed in favor of truth. A hand mill may become disordered in its movements, without any very disastrous consequences. It is only that the man at the crank has wasted a little of his labor. But the irregular movements of the Steam Engine, spread destruction and terror far and wide.

It is on this principle, that we hold it to be the duty of all who love the truth, to encourage every effort that is calculated to give a right direction to public sentiment. Whether writers are engaged in the more difficult field of doctrinal discussion, or in the pleasanter employment, of giving a practical influence to the truth, they are co-workers in the same cause, and ought always to give each other an encouraging look, and as occasion requires, a helping hand. The labours of such men as Edwards, and Bellamy, and Dwight, in clearing religious truth from vain

speculations, which hindered its success, and laid it open to the objections of the captious, have prepared the way for such men as the author now before us, to enter in, and avail himself of their labors, by giving a practical exhibition of the proper tendency of the Gospel. There is no occasion of jealousy, nor any ground for one class to undervalue the efforts of the other. "If they were all one member, where were the body? Shall the ear say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body?" We respect the motive of every one who heartily engages in this cause. When such authors as this are engaged, we applaud their performance. We know not this writer's name, but we believe he has achieved a service of no inconsiderable value to the cause of Christ. And if his heart has been in his work, (and how otherwise could he do it so well?) he has won for himself a crown of reward.

In the two little works before us, the author has attempted, and we think in a happy manner, to illustrate the influence of divine truth, and the process of conversion, in two classes of very amiable persons, who appear, in the eyes of superficial observers, not to need any such change as is denoted by the new birth. One class is composed of the more tender hearted, such as the matron and the youth; and the other, of the sober, reflecting, and respectable men of the world. The characters are all taken from the refined part of society, and nothing is admitted which should wound the finest feelings, or disgust the most delicate taste. Nor is their literary merit merely negative. We think them decidedly calculated to raise the tone of thought, and to refine the minds of those readers, whose previous attainments are such, as prepares them duly to appreciate their worth. And we believe that in our country, such a degree of mental cultivation is very extensively diffused; and consequently, that these

volumes are adapted for very extensive circulation and usefulness.

The general object of the writer seems to be to show the false notions of the nature of piety, which are entertained by many amiable persons; and to expose the weakness of the objections which sceptical minds adduce, against experimental religion. Although there is much that is didactic, and upon some very difficult points, yet the writer has had the address to keep up a good degree of interest. There is very little incident, and consequently the life of the pieces depends chiefly upon the air of sincerity and real earnestness which he contrives to give to his characters.

The books take something of a dramatic form. They are written with an easy mixture of narration and dialogue, which offers some advantages to the writers of similar works. This mode relieves an author, on the one hand from the necessity of making speeches, merely to keep up the thread of the story, where narration would do the thing better, and in fewer words; and on the other hand, prevents the awkwardness of the continually recurring expletives, "says he," and "says she."

In regard to the writer's views of the doctrines of the gospel, and of their practical bearing, they correspond, in the main, with those which prevail in this country. He seems to have studied Edwards with some attention, and probably Bellamy, and some other of our writers. Yet we cannot but think so quick and acute a mind would find itself abundantly repaid, for a still more careful examination of such writers. There is, in some of his statements, a want of discrimination, and in some of his arguments a want of completeness, which will weaken their force. It is easy for a man who believes, to jump at a conclusion but he must not expect unbelievers and cavillers to take the leap. If he cannot make his connexion perfect, his argument

is gone. We might be ourselves, disposed to controvert some of his positions, although we decisively approve his system. We should be still more apt to think that in some instances he had failed, on the one hand, by attempting to explain what is inexplicable; and on the other, by not giving what appears to us to be the true explanation of questions which are within the reach of the human intellect. We refer our readers, who have access to the volumes, to page 103, of "*Profession is not Principle*," for apposite examples. President Edwards' theory about the origin of evil there adopted, appears to be an instance of the first, and the waving all inquiry into the nature of the Atonement on the same page, may pass for an instance of the other deficiency. To discuss these, and some other subjects, which the work has suggested, would carry us to a length not comporting with our present design. On the whole, the works are adapted to give high ideas of the purity of God's Law, and to establish an elevated standard of Christian action, while they lead the mind to look only to the Lord Jesus Christ for justification and life.

We proceed to give a brief account of each book. The first in point of time is "*The Decision*." The principal character is a young lady of that class of persons, "who, though they at first revolt at the idea, that they whom they love and esteem, are not only themselves ignorant of true religion, but have educated them also in ignorance of it, are yet too honest and candid to resist *truth* when it is placed before them; and who cannot rest satisfied till they have examined, whether all is indeed right, both with themselves, and with those they love." The name of this young lady is Gertrude Aberley; and she, with her widowed mother, and Edward and Anna, her brother and sister, make up the characters in the first part or act. The scene is laid at Mrs. Aberley's

house in London. Mrs. A. from a mistaken view of the true interest of her children, had involved them in all the gaiety and dissipation of a London winter. Their cousin Charles Ashton, had recently forsaken a very dissipated course of life, and had become wholly and ardently devoted to true religion. He not only felt and exemplified its power, in himself, but he wished and laboured, that others might know the same peace, and engage in the same cause. Gertrude was the first among his friends, who began to listen to his appeals in favour of religion, and to feel the unsatisfying nature of the worldly pleasures in which she was involved.

"He gradually gained her attention; and she felt a wish to hear that kind of preaching to which he ascribed a change so unaccountable. With her mother's consent, she accompanied her aunt, Mrs. Ashton, to hear her cousin's favourite preacher. She heard; and her mind soon fully acquiesced in the truth delivered by a servant of God, whose life was holy, whose reasoning was conclusive, and whose manner bespoke the deep feeling he himself had of those truths he taught. Gertrude began to study the Scriptures, and felt that she never before had understood them. The life of gaiety in which she was involved became irksome to her; but she did not immediately perceive that it was her duty to forsake it." p. 7.

But before the following winter, her mind was made up, and her resolution became fixed, for the service of God. She had to encounter as much opposition as could be expected, in an affectionate family, absorbed in the gaieties of life, but who yet were so well informed on religious subjects, as to make the self-denial and spiritual-mindedness of a young convert a constant source of self-reproach and uneasiness. Her conversations with her mother and sister, which are detailed, are extremely faithful, judicious, and affectionate, and may well serve as a model to others in like circumstances. The first member of the family, however, who "became infected," was her brother Edward. "He had entered upon the follies and vices of young

men of his age and fortune, with an eagerness that made him spurn all restraint, and cost his mother many a secret tear." How great then must have been Gertrude's surprise, when Charles came into her chamber, and opened to her the workings of a heart, sick of folly, and longing to find substantial good. After describing to her, in language that will hardly be apprehended, in its full force and meaning, but by those who have themselves experienced the same, the conflict which had been going on in his mind, he tells her he had been to hear her favourite preacher, Mr. Percy. Perhaps we cannot give a fairer example of our author's manner, than by copying the account of the sermon, with the conversation to which it gave rise, between Edward and Gertrude.

"EDWARD. But, to shorten my story, when I was in a shop this forenoon, I saw an advertisement, purporting that Mr. Percy was to preach a sermon this evening in behalf of some charitable institution. I immediately felt an inclination to hear this person, whose preaching had produced such a marvellous effect on your mind; and at a time when I was sure no one who knew me would be there. I therefore disengaged myself from a party with whom I had promised to dine, and, when the time came, wrapped myself up in a great coat, and went to the church. It was about half full when I arrived, and I seated myself in a pew where I could have an excellent view of the preacher. I confess, Gertrude, for I must tell you both my bad and good feelings, part of my intention in going was to surprise you with my knowledge of the manner and style of your favourite. When I was seated in my pew, observing the people as they crowded in, I confess, Gertrude, the scene appeared to me very unattractive, and our friend Charles Ormond's lines, which he says are prose verse, came into my thoughts most forcibly. They describe the filling of a church of that kind to the life; and his own feelings were exactly what I experienced when I saw the unlovely assemblage of poor mechanics, and fine pious ladies, and fat citizens, all showering in, jostled together.

"My young eye, proud and careless, gazed abroad.
O'er those who crowded there, nor loved the scene:

I cared not though their hearts were God's
abode,
But scanning their poor aspects low and mean,
I shunned their crowding near, as holier I
had been.

And still they crowded in; some calm and slow,
As they had thought on him they worshipp'd there;
And some all haste, with eager anxious brow,
Bustling with selfish speed to seize a share
Of most commodious pew, with little care
How others sped—their kindling looks the while
Betraying their poor hearts, if unaware
Some earlier worshipper their speed beguile,
And sit where they would sit, with pleased unconscious smile."

GER. That picture is drawn by an enemy, Oh that I had been with you, Edward! I should have sat joyfully by the lowest and the meanest. But do go on.

EDW. Well, the people crowded in till there was no more room in the pews, and numbers stood in the passages. I began to think of coming out, it was so stifling; and an old labourer, who had drawn on his Sunday coat over all his week day filth, placed himself to stand and lean against the pew where I sat with a coarse dirty hand, holding an old greasy hat just under my nose.

GER. Oh Edward! Did you not think how much the poor old man must have loved the house of God, when, after a day of labour, he was contented to stand two hours that he might be present there.

EDW. Not till I had made a movement which made the old man look round. I suppose he saw disgust in my looks, for he immediately removed to a little distance, and putting his hat on the ground, stood without any support; no expression of displeasure passed over his mild but manly countenance. My heart smote me, but Mr. Percy at that moment appeared, and both my old man and I were instantly occupied. I confess, Gertrude, Mr. Percy's looks and manner are extremely prepossessing. He read prayers, during which my mind became unusually calm and happy, though I cannot say I was attending to them; but softening thoughts, which have been strangers to my bosom of late, again visited me; and I believe they were excited in a great degree by the devout and happy looks of my poor despised old man, whose face was now a little turned to me, and expressed much feeling, and even elevation, while he joined in the service. "How much fairer and purer his soul is than mine," thought I. "Were we both

at this moment disembodied, and in the presence of our Judge, which of us should feel that he ought to shrink back, and give place to the other?" It was not difficult to decide that it would be the proud sinner, who had a few minutes before so unfeelingly insulted the poor saint. When prayers were over, I with great difficulty persuaded the old man to take my place, and I took his.

GER. Dear Edward! and were you allowed to stand.

EDW. Oh, indeed I was. There was no room any where; but I felt very happy; and after Mr. Percy began, I had not a thought for any thing but his discourse.

GER. What was his subject?—his text?

EDW. It was this—"Ye will not come to me that ye might have life." I do not recollect what part of the Bible he took it from.

GER. From St. John. Most gracious words! But proceed.

EDW. He began in a manner so calm, and dignified, and solemn, to describe those who would not come to the Saviour of the world that they might have life, that my attention was entirely fixed; and each description of character suited exactly some people who immediately came into my thoughts. He described our guardian, Mr. Lornton, to the very life—his regularity—his abhorrence and dread of whatever is disreputable—his rectitude in all worldly matters—and yet his utter forgetfulness of God. His nicety in fulfilling every duty to his fellow-men, and his absolute contempt of his duty to God. No appearance of love to God—neglect of his instituted worship. Profanation of his Sabbath by travelling—or seeing company—or doing whatever he chooses, in contempt of that express command, which says,—Thou shalt do no manner of work on the Sabbath day, thou, nor thy servants, nor thy cattle.—Oh, Gertrude, how boldly we all dare to disobey God! Only think of the manner in which the Sabbath is usually spent, and how plainly the commandment forbids all we do.

GER. Yes, dear Edward, he is a long-suffering God, who bears with us. I sometimes tremble when I see the daring disregard of his plainest commandments, which my very dearest friends venture upon. It is an awful thought. But go on.

EDW. Mr. Percy described many characters. Our aunt Stanly most exactly—so formally exact in external religious observances, while her whole heart is engaged with this world.

GER. Edward, how can you judge of aunt Stanly's heart; Those descriptions are not intended to lead us to judge of others; they are intended to lead us to self-examination, that we may ascertain in what respects our own characters re-

semble those portrayed by the servant of God, whose duty it is thus to search and probe the heart, that it may be healed.

EDW. Well, I only wish aunt Stanly had been there. She must have recognized herself—prayers in the morning, and theatre in the evening, and —

GER. I will not hear aunt Stanly's character. Did he not describe Edward Aberley. (Smiling.)

EDW. Oh yes, and Mamma, too—so fond of her children, yet so—

GER. No more, Edward. It is not right—indeed it is not.

EDW. Now, Gertrude, I have said nothing, so it is you who are wrong in anticipating an unfavourable character of Mamma.

GER. I confess it is so; but I would rather hear Mr. Percy's character of you.

EDW. His character of Mamma, however, softened me to tears; and he concluded by saying there was the best hope of such characters; for they erred not from want of candour, but from want of light; and that they dreaded becoming truly and strictly devoted to God, not from indifference or enmity to real religion, but from a sincere apprehension that, in so devoting themselves, they would in some indefinite way be neglecting duties that they ought to fulfil.

GER. Well, I do think so of Mamma sometimes. But no more of her. Why are you so long in coming to the character I most wish to hear described?

EDW. Oh, because it comes so close; but I want your advice, so you shall have all. Mr. Percy kept my character to the last; and when he began to describe it, the interest and feeling of his voice and manner seemed to increase. I think I remember his very words. He said—"There is still another class of persons to whom I must speak, and ask them why they do not come to Christ that they may have life? Or, Perhaps, I may rather ask you, my young friends, (for to you I speak,) *Do you know Him whom you disregard and reject?* No, you know him not. I think I shall be able to convince you of this, if you will yield me your attention for a few moments, and let your hearts reply candidly to the questions I shall ask you. Do you not believe, that if you listened to the remonstrance of the text, and attempted to come to Christ for life, that the first step you must take would be to give up all earthly enjoyments—all that at this moment is most attractive to you?—and all this you imagine must be given up, for what?—you cannot say for what. To you the idea of becoming religious is altogether an idea of deprivation—of giving up—of leaving what is delightful. You see that those of your own age who become religious, immediately lose all relish for their for

mer, and your present pursuits. You see that they immediately begin to love the house of God. They love to be alone, that they may pray, and read, and learn more of God. They see every thing in a new light; and their opinions and sentiments on almost every subject differ from yours; but all this, though an unaccountable something may lead you to respect and love them, does not convince you that they have in reality found that happiness which they assure you they have found. You only regard them as gloomy; or as having been so alarmed, by the preacher or by some other means, respecting the future state of their souls in another world, that, under the strength of the impression, they became willing, in order to secure their salvation hereafter, to live a life of gloom, and wretchedness, and self-denial in this world. Is not this really your only idea respecting religion, that it is the enduring of gloom and deprivation in this world, to purchase by that means happiness in the next? But you entertain this opinion, because you do not know that Lord and Master for whom Christians give up all that he disapproves. If you knew him as they know him, you would feel as they do, that he, and he only, is deserving of that place in your hearts which he, and he only can fill. These are perhaps words without meaning to you. Let me try to portray some faint traces of that all-glorious character; or, rather, let me ask you to look around on what you know and acknowledge to be his works, and say, do you trace nothing of his greatness, and also of his tenderness, on the face of his creation? Why is it all so fair and lovely? Why such profusion of all that is sublime, and soft, and touching? Why such perfection and beauty? and whence the power which these inanimate objects possess, to attract and charm the heart? and who formed the heart to feel that power? Is there no trace of the footsteps of one here, who, if we could find him, we would love with love unspeakable? But, my young friends, lovely and touching as his works of creation are, his work of redemption is still more lovely. His works of creation ought to lead us to seek after their all-glorious Creator, but in his work of redemption he has brought himself near to us. He has come in search of us. He has left that glory in which he dwelt with the Father, and where those highest spirits who are permitted to approach nearest to him are so overwhelmed by the brightness of the vision, that they veil their faces with their wings, and express continually their adoration, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty! This glorious Jehovah, in love to us, that he might bring himself near, close to us; took our nature into his, that he might in that nature fulfil the

broken law of God for us; that he might bear the punishment due to us for the breach of that law; and that he might experience and know all our feelings and griefs. He became our very nearest friend; for what other friend both sees our inmost feelings, and feels them also? He is the omnipotent God, and also man; and in that character he is at this moment present with us, reproaching us in those most tender and condescending terms, "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life." I have purchased eternal life for you, but you despise that for which I laid down my life. You have ruined yourselves—you have disobeyed the laws of God. "There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby ye can be saved," but mine, yet ye will not come unto me! I have left the glory of the Father—I have taken the form of a servant, and have endured the cross for you, and ye will not come unto me! "Come now, let us reason together, saith the Lord; for what things are they that ye reject the Lord Jehovah?" And then, Oh, Gertrude! how forcibly Mr. Percy spoke; and what fools he made those appear who preferred the trifles of this world to the salvation, and friendship, and guidance of the Son of God. He described my character—in youth—health—with the advantages of education, friends, fortune, influence, and not a thought but to gratify the passion of the moment. He painted my guilt and responsibility so as to make me tremble, and inwardly to implore God to have mercy on me. He then described what such an one might be, if, convinced of his sins, he fled for refuge to Christ, who would receive him, and give him a new heart, and put his spirit within him, to lead him into all truth. Then, Oh, Gertrude, such a character as he described! a blessing to society—happy in his own soul—his Master's image becoming more and more visible in him. I cannot say all he said, but I can never hope to be such a one. Oh, that I could! (*Covers his face with his hands, and bursts into tears.*)

GER. And why not hope, my dearest Edward? Mr. Percy did not say you could make yourself such a character.

EDW. Oh, no! He said I could do nothing without Christ. It was on this point he so forcibly convinced me I had hitherto erred. He said we could no more produce even one good thought without Him, than a branch could produce fruit, if separated from its parent tree.

GER. Then, my brother, to become such a character, you have only to come to Christ, to believe in him, to learn his will from his own word; and when you have learnt it, to implore him to enable you to obey it.—pp. 23—32.

At the conclusion of a long interview, Edward determines to tear himself from his companions, and to retire to his estate in Scotland, "in order to make himself acquainted with the will of his God and Saviour."

Mrs. Aberley and Anna had gone to a ball, where they could not free their minds from the influence of the solemn truths which Gertrude had urged upon their consideration. They returned, satisfied that they had mistaken the road to happiness, and with an arrow in their hearts, which no human skill could extract. Next morning, at the breakfast table, they held a very interesting conversation with Gertrude. The result appears in the following extract.

Enter ANNA.

ANNA. Has Gertrude given you any intelligence respecting Edward, Mamma?

Mrs. ABER. Yes, my dear. But how pale and *misrested* you look!

ANNA. Oh I shall soon revive if I go with you into the open air. Let us drive a few miles out of town, and get some fresh flowers at Duncan's. But what has Gertrude told you, Mamma? Tell me, Gertrude, while I try to swallow some breakfast. I have no appetite.

Mrs. ABER. Anna, will you go to Scotland?

ANNA. To Scotland! Are you serious, Mamma?

Mrs. ABER. Your brother is gone there, and, Gertrude says, is anxious that we should follow him. If I find that he is serious, then I shall be so also.

ANNA. To Scotland! I cannot trust my senses—at this season too, when parties have multiplied upon us. Well, if I am to be no happier than I was last night, I shall not lose much. But our quadrille party at Mrs. Anson's—it would be treating her extremely ill if I deserted it, after having practised with her daughters all the winter. (*Shaking her head thoughtfully.*) You know, Mamma, that, is impossible. Gertrude, why do you smile? Do you think it such a trifle to be disobliging and uncivil?

GER. I think it possible that some other young lady may be found, *nearly* capable of supplying your place.

ANNA. Oh, indeed, it is not so easy; and, besides, every body is engaged long ago. But what is that you are about? You are become so very industrious, you seem to think it sinful to be a moment without a rag and a needle, like the children at the charity schools, that Cousin

Ashton will drag us to admire. Are you really going to mend that old pocket-handkerchief.

GER. (*Laughing.*) No. You see I am cutting it.

ANNA. And what is here? (*opening a little parcel,*) three baby caps! How nice and soft!

GER. And just made of an old cambric handkerchief.

ANNA. Well they are very nice. And have you undertaken to work for the Foundling Hospital?

GER. (*Laughing.*) No; but a poor woman whom Sally knows about, who, before, had a large family and a sickly husband, has had twins a day or two ago; and having prepared only a very spare provision of clothes for one, the other poor little thing had none.

ANNA. (*Remains thoughtful for a few moments.*) Gertrude, will you tell me exactly how you have spent your time since we parted last night?

Mrs. ABER. You seem to have forgotten, Anna, that you have not answered my question.

ANNA. Mamma, you will do me a great favour, if you will allow me to have Gertrude's answer first.

Mrs. ABER. Well, let it be so.

ANNA. Gertrude, do tell me how you have spent every hour since we parted?

GER. Dear Anna, I have not spent my time since last night in any unusual manner.

Mrs. ABER. Do, my love, gratify her. I too wish to know.

GER. Well, Mamma, you were scarcely gone when Edward came to me, and we conversed together for nearly an hour. Then Sally came to me to be taught to read, and to know something respecting another world, and her duty to God. I then remained alone for a short time—a happy little space—after which I went to bed; and while Morley undressed me, she took occasion to say she was afraid she had been disobliging to Miss Anna, but that her temper was naturally hot, and that nobody could help their natural tempers: for Morley often confesses herself to me.

ANNA. I hope you gave her a good lecture.

GER. No; But I tried to convince her that her natural temper might be changed, if she would apply to Him who alone can heal the diseases of the mind and heart. I then went to sleep, and slept profoundly till I was called in time to be dressed by seven o'clock.

ANNA. Morley, I am sure, would not attend you at that hour.

GER. How can you suppose it possible she should, after sitting up for you? Poor thing, I think she would be a better girl if she were taken pains with; but the

foolish books she lives upon, make her the ridiculous creature she is.

Mrs. ABER. What books?

GER. Every night that she sits up for you and Anna, Mamma, she employs herself in reading some foolish novel. She told me so herself, and said nothing else would keep her awake. You know, Mamma, the housekeeper makes all the other women go to bed. I gave her other books, but she says my books make her think herself so wicked she dare not stay alone; and when she goes down stairs she finds nobody but old John, who scolds her for being idle.

Mrs. ABER. (*Sighing.*) This is not as it ought to be.

ANNA. But go on, Gertrude; what did you do at seven o'clock this morning?

GER. I spent the next hour in private, Anna, and that is the happiest hour of all the day to me, and prepares me for whatever may happen; because I then seek that strength and guidance which is promised to those who ask for them. I then gave Sally another lesson. Then wrote a long letter to Edward, which he asked me to do; and then came hither in hopes of finding you and breakfast; but, being disappointed in that hope, I began to work at these baby caps, and have had time to make one while waiting for you.

Mrs. ABER. My love, are you so long up without food?

GER. Oh, no, Sally is very attentive to me, and the housekeeper also.

ANNA. Yes, they all love you. Morley says Miss Gertrude is an angel in temper, and gives no trouble; and that it is an honor to be allowed to attend her, besides making one better, just to see how good and quiet she is.

GER. Hush, Anna. You ought not to allow Morley to speak so foolishly.

Mrs. ABER. I must say Sally is the most changed creature I ever saw.

GER. Now Anna, answer Mamma's question.

ANNA. First allow me to tell you how I have spent my time since we parted, Gertrude.

GER. (*Smiling.*) But you know I always displease you by yawning when you describe your parties. But if you will spare me the decorations and dresses, I shall try to be attentive.

ANNA. I think my feelings last night were gloomy enough to excite your interest, Gertrude. The promise I half made to you returned to my thoughts continually during the whole evening; and I could not feel that any thing I did or said was such as it ought to have been in that presence in which you had desired me to remember I was. I wished to get rid of the thought, but felt frightened, as if I had been trying to separate myself from God. I can scarcely describe what I felt. I was

asked if I was unwell. I was rallied on my absence of manners; and aunt Stanly, who was near me at one time, said in a whisper to me, "I protest Anna, you look to night exactly as Gertrude did at the two or three last balls she honoured with her presence;" and so I answered, "I wish I was like Gertrude." I longed to get home; yet when I found myself alone I was no happier; for I could no more feel then that I was worthy to be in the presence of God than I was before. Oh! I have passed a wretched night, falling asleep and then waking in a fright. My mind was too uneasy to suffer me to sleep. Now I will answer your question, Mamma. If Mr. Percy was in Scotland, I should like to go there; but I would rather hear him than any other thing now. Oh, Mamma, Gertrude is more in the right than I am. I am sure she is.

Mrs. ABER. Anna, we must examine this matter more closely. Gertrude tells me your brother has gone to Scotland for the single purpose of enjoying solitude and leisure that he may read the Scriptures. I wish also to have some quiet time for the same purpose. As to your two objections, the quadrille party and Mr. Percy, I think you must try to get over the first; and Gertrude says the clergyman at Arnavoir is of the same sentiments with Mr. Percy.

ANNA. Is he so? Then I shall easily reconcile myself to the idea of Mrs. Anson's displeasure. But only think of Edward? Well I have thought him very odd of late. Do you wish to go to Scotland, Gertrude?

GER. I do very much indeed.

Mrs. ABER. Well then, I shall write this day to Edward, and in the mean time we shall make arrangements for leaving town. If your brother answers, as we hope he will, then we shall go to Scotland; if not, we shall all be glad to go for a time to Calmly Lodge.—pp. 51—56.

In Part II. several new characters are introduced. There is Ashton, the cousin to whom the whole family were so much indebted for his christian faithfulness. Mr. Lornton, the guardian of the young people. Mr. Ross, the minister of the parish where the family estate is situated, and Allan Cameron, the pious old soldier, who attended Col. Aberley, after his wound, on the day when "brave Abercrombie fell" in Egypt. The scene is laid at Arnavoir Castle, and the time is the day succeeding the arrival of Mrs. A. and her daughters. An interesting review is taken of what had trans-

pired during two months separation. The family had passed through some solemn and instructive scenes, and all had made progress in their knowledge of divine truth. Anna, with her characteristic ardor and rashness, had endeavoured to promote her piety, and to mortify the sinful affections, by excessive rigor and singularity. This leads to a few judicious remarks from Mr. Ross, which contain so much practical instruction to young converts, that we gladly copy them.

Edw. This is an evening, my dear Mr. Ross, quite after your own heart.

Mr. Ross. And what heart, my dear Mr. Aberley, could resist the influence of such an evening? God speaks to us by his works; and when their language is all gentleness and tenderness, shall our hearts not be softened, and reply in gratitude and love?

ANNA. Many who are still dead to the power of religion, are yet exquisitely alive to the beauties of nature.

Mr. Ross. Certainly, Miss Aberley; many are so.

ANNA. And they have expressed their admiration in language so powerfully impressive, that they have taken away all my pleasure in beholding those beauties. At this moment Lord Byron's lines, descriptive of his Lara's feelings on viewing the softness of moonlight, and his dark mind turning away from its loveliness, haunt my thoughts.

Mr. Ross. But, Miss Aberley, that description is beautifully just.

ANNA. But I now dislike every association of ideas which leads my mind back to the state it was in when I almost worshipped these authors.

Mr. Ross. Perhaps it would have been better for the world had such authors never written: yet there are some passages, even in Lord Byron, which are exquisitely beautiful from their truth. His delineation of a mind, conscious of its guilt and darkness, and ignorant of the way of peace, do more than impress and excite the imagination—they confirm some of the most important truths of scripture.

ANNA. But still it is the imagination that is captivated by such works—and surely it ought to be forced or starved into subjection.

Mr. Ross. (*Smiling.*) I am afraid it will not submit to be starved, Miss Aberley. It ought to have *proper* food; but if it is denied such, I fear it will become less nice, and be satisfied with what is poor and trifling. There is perhaps no other power of the mind which, in youth at least, requires such constant attention.

ANNA. I feel so. I cannot get it suppressed.

Mr. Ross. (*Smiling.*) No, I believe that is hopeless. But you can occupy it with what is really important, and really lovely, and really excellent.

Mrs. ABER. You will find, my dear Sir, that my poor Anna has some very peculiar ways of thinking. I am rejoiced to think she will have it in her power to receive instruction from you. Edward is already deeply your debtor; and I am afraid you will find us all anxious to encroach on your precious time, and on your patience.

Mr. Ross. It is the delight of a minister of Christ, Madam, to be occupied in his Master's service, when his labours are valued. It cheers his heart, and strengthens his hands.

Mrs. ABER. You are kind in thus encouraging us to trouble you, my dear Sir. I trust we are all in earnest, though my dear Anna is, I fear, in error on many points. I feel thankful that Gertrude, and not she, was the first of my family who became religious. I fear, had Anna been the first, she would have disgusted us all by her, what appears to me, absurd peculiarities. For instance, my Anna makes it a matter of conscience to dress in the most ridiculous and particular manner, so that all her young friends regard her change on that point, as a part of her new religion.

ANNA. But pray, Mamma, tell Mr. Ross how many precious hours I have lost in studying dress. Ought not such inclinations to be mortified? Besides, St. Paul says, that women professing godliness should not adorn themselves with costly array.

Mrs. ABER. I do not wish it to be costly, my love. All I ask is that it shall not be particular, and throw an air of ridicule over us all. But, Mr. Ross, I must lay more of my poor Anna's peculiarities before you. During the last six or eight weeks we have been in London, she has considered it her duty to teach every person whom she had it in her power to speak to. Whoever was our visitor, Anna instantly attempted to introduce the subject of religion; and though the person she addressed might at the time be involved in the vortex of fashionable amusements, Anna would begin to condemn them all—dancing as folly and waste of time—concerts as the same—the theatre as utterly sinful—and going to admire Miss O'Neil as delighting in the sacrifice of a human soul, and consequently more inhuman than the Roman ladies were, who found pleasure in witnessing the earthly agonies of gladiators. She reproved every one; and, in short, has made every one dislike her; and all this, while she herself must necessarily have a very small portion of religious knowledge. Can all this be right?

Mr. Ross. Can Miss Aberley quote St. Paul's authority for all this, as she did respecting dress?

ANNA. Not exactly, for each particular Mamma has mentioned. Yet how should I have known that any of these things were sinful, unless Gertrude had taken pains to convince me that they were so?

Mr. Ross. Were you convinced they were sinful, merely by Miss Gertrude's saying so?

ANNA. No, certainly, unless I had seen that Gertrude had really lost all pleasure in such things, and really delighted in religion—I should not have attended merely to her opinions. But when I saw the change that had taken place in her, my conscience told me that what had produced that change, was a reality of love to God—a reality of wishing to please and serve him of which my heart was destitute—and I hope the consciences of others will speak to them the same language, when I speak truth to them. I am willing to be hated and scorned, provided I carry truth to any soul. You do not know, Sir, what I have suffered from the terrors of an awakened conscience; nor the anxiety I feel to lead others to leave that state of blindness in which I so lately was. Oh! what madness; what folly it now appears to me to spend hours, and days, and years, as I have done. Every thing respecting God and eternity seems now so awfully real! Why should I value people's opinion of me, in comparison with the chance of leading them into truth?

Mr. Ross. And have you, Miss Aberley, been the happy means of leading any one to the knowledge of the truth?

ANNA. Not that I know of; but I resisted conviction too long myself, to wonder at any one else doing so. But tell me, Sir, do *you* think I have been wrong? I beg you will speak truth—plain truth to me however severe. Was I wrong in attempting to point out truth to others, while so ignorant myself?

Mr. Ross. (*Gently.*) I feel afraid, my dear Miss Aberley, to condemn what was done under the impressions you describe, and with so much indifference respecting the consequences to yourself. Yet the very kindest and best services may be performed in such a way as to defeat the very intentions with which they are done. We must ever remember, in attempting to lead people to think as we do, that we are human beings endeavouring to influence human beings, and must use those arguments which we know by experience are attractive to the human heart. A real change must come from God; but He uses means suited to the end. A plain declaration of truth is one means, and conscience will be on the side of that truth: yet if it is declared in a manner

revolting to the heart, conscience has then to struggle against the disgust of the heart, and will not easily be heard. On the contrary, if the heart is won along with the conscience, all is won. St. Paul exhorts us to attend to what is lovely and of good report in all we do, and he himself is beautifully tender and gentle in his treatment of the ignorant. Now, my dear Miss Aberley, it is not *felt* to be lovely, neither is it of good report, for very young persons to presume to teach, particularly when they themselves have scarcely escaped from those errors against which they warn others.

ANNA. But if we receive light, are we entitled to put it under a bushel?

Mr. Ross. (*Smiling.*) No, we are to let it "so shine, that men *seeing our good works*, may glorify our Father who is in heaven."

ANNA. But is it not a good work to warn others from your own experience that they are ruining themselves?

Mr. Ross. You cannot, my dear Miss Aberley, by mere words, convince any one that your experience is light from heaven.

ANNA. But if I am utterly changed, they wilfully shut their eyes if they do not see that the change is of God.

Mr. Ross. That must depend entirely on the nature of the conduct exhibited. I would not discourage you, Miss Aberley; but when God opens your eyes to perceive what that reality is which you now term an utter change, and when you come to look back on the present state of your heart and conduct, you will be less surprised at the slowness of others, and will wonder that you should have regarded yourself as "utterly changed," and that by the Holy Spirit. Forgive my plainness—what I say of you, I would say of any one who had come so very lately from a state of ignorance, into the knowledge of the first principles of truth.

ANNA. I love what you say. The severity of truth has become strangely agreeable to me. But then must I be silent? Must I never shew to others that way of salvation which I myself have found?

Mr. Ross. I do not say so: but it is not easy to lay down any rule on this point. What I would advise is this. As it is impossible that you should be otherwise than ignorant, study the Scriptures; might I say study them on your knees—at least with a praying heart, over every passage. Realize continually the presence of God in Christ. You know He is the only way to the Father. Search the Scriptures for those passages which reveal to you the character of your Lord, and in what relation he stands to you. Pray earnestly for his Spirit to enlighten your mind, and reveal the character and work of Christ to your soul—rest not till

you know what it is to "abide in Him"—till you can say, He is your peace, and your righteousness, and your joy. This is the first lesson a young Christian has to learn. Live near this Lord—without him you can do nothing. Follow on to know him more and more—make yourself acquainted with his word, praying for his grace to enable you to walk according to it; and, instead of aiming at distinguishing yourself by some great effort, undertake nothing without bringing the matter to him in prayer, imploring his guidance and his Spirit to shew you how unable you are of yourself to do any thing aright. Walking thus, you will not readily offend by speaking rashly or harshly to any one; and if you should offend by speaking truth in the spirit of love and meekness, you are then only in the path of duty.

ANNA. (*Sighing.*) I know little of such walking. You have made me feel how poor, and blind, and miserable I am. pp.—72—78.

The character of Mr. Lornton, we fear, is not a very rare one, among the more respectable class of irreligious men. There is reason to believe, that one who could accurately read hearts, would frequently find those who are not avowed atheists, nor even infidels, and who possess all this man's "regularity, his abhorrence of what is mean, and dread of what is disreputable, his rectitude in all worldly matters, and his utter forgetfulness of God;" who, when touched by the finger of the Almighty, and deprived of what they hold most dear, settle down into a sullen and desperate *atheism of the heart* which casts the gloom of desolation over their character. Yet they are not therefore to be regarded as certainly lost. *While there's life there's hope.* A conversation between Mr. L. and Gertrude, leads to the following remarks, which *speaks out* a train of thought and feeling, not by any means unexampled in irreligious minds.

MR. LORNTON. (*Sternly.*) What can we know of the mercy of God?

GER. (*Shrinking back, and with surprise.*) How!

MR. LORNTON. (*Bitterly.*) Twice in my life I have cast myself on what I had been taught was the mercy of God, and both times I might have equally prayed to the winds. Do not suppose, child, that all those whom you see disregarding the forms of religion, do so from utter indiffer-

ence to the subject. Most men have had their time of religion—their religious history—some dark enough.

GER. (*Gently but firmly.*) You have, my dear Sir, misunderstood the Providence of God respecting yourself.

MR. LORNTON. Twice, Gertrude, my whole happiness has been wrapt up in the lives of two dear objects. The first became ill. I prayed with my whole soul to that Being who I believed was merciful, and the only disposer of life and death. I prayed that the idol of my affections might be spared to me, and my prayer was disregarded. I then had just begun to know your father, and my disappointed affections soon centered in him. He was ordered abroad. I knew his brave and gallant spirit, and foresaw that he would be wherever danger was. Again I prayed and appealed to the compassion of the Most High. I heard that my most beloved friend was wounded. Still I hoped on the *mercy* of heaven; but heard of his death. Why should I pray, or believe there is that attribute in the divine character which we call mercy? Our little distant griefs cannot interfere with the course of things in the immense arrangements of the Deity.

GER. (*Mildly but warmly.*) And did you, my dear Sir, come into the presence of God, and say, "O God, thou hast taught us that thou only art worthy of the first place in our hearts. Thou hast condescended to say to each of us, 'Give me thine heart.' Thou hast even declared thyself a jealous God, who will suffer no rivals—no idols; yet here I have one precious, beloved, only possessor of my heart. Thou only art the disposer of life and death. I pray thee, ruin my soul, by preserving to me this rival who has usurped thy place in my affections, and separates my heart from thee its only good?" And when God in love refused this prayer, and took away that which came between himself and your soul, instead of returning to Him who in mercy smote that he might heal you, did you instantly set up another idol to worship with your affections instead of Him, and again insult him by prayers to preserve to you his rival; and are you displeased because in love he again refused you, and left your heart empty and desolate, that he himself might fill it? Are you not, my dear Sir, saying there is no mercy where all is mercy?

MR. LORNTON. (*Gently.*) You are a strange arguer, my child. According to you, God loves you not in giving you so many objects of affection, and would shew his kindness more by taking your mother, and brother, and sister from you.

GER. If I loved them more than him; but I hope he has the first place in my affections; and my constant prayer to him is, to suffer no rivals in my heart.

Mr. LORN. Well, my dear, may you always suppose your prayers are answered?

GER. Suppose! O my dear Sir, how dishonouring to the omnipotent, omniscient God, is your cold unloving assent to his general and superintending Providence; while you, not from disbelieving in revelation, but from his rejection of a prayer which it would have injured you to grant, spurn from you the revealed and most delightful truth, that so minute is the care of God over all of us, that even a hair of our heads cannot change colour without him!—pp. 88—90.

The peasantry of the estate were engaged in celebrating the event of Edward's coming of age, with great ceremony; and while he was addressing the people, and explaining the general system which he intended to pursue, in regard to his tenantry, old Allan Cameron was introduced, bringing Col. Aberley's bible, which had been committed to his care by the Colonel at his death. The whole scene is an interesting one. We can give only the latter part.

ALLAN. I was near Colonel Aberley when he received his wound. Two horses had been shot under him during the day. Some officers received him in their arms as he fell. I saw no more till after the battle was over. I was then sent for to him. A ball had been extracted from his side, and from that and other wounds he had lost so much blood, that he looked very faint and pale, but his countenance had the same sweet and noble expression as ever. I was commanded to keep all quiet around him. This was not easy, so many came to enquire for him. When at last we were alone, and all the camp at rest but the poor sufferers, he said to me, "Cameron, I may die of this wound. I have thought too little of death. Have you your Bible here? I have no Bible." I brought my Bible, but entreated him to try to rest, as the doctor had desired. He did so, and commanded me to do the same. I wrapped my cloak around me, and lay down by his bed. Early in the morning he took my Bible and began to read, I got up, but he commanded me to rest till he called me. He did not again speak for more than an hour, then said, "Cameron, come and tell me how you have read this Bible, so as to acquire that son-like feeling of confidence with which I heard you address God the other night. I feel none of it. The more I think of appearing before Him, the more I shrink from the reality as tremendously awful." He then lis-

tened to my poor endeavours to point out the way of return and access to God, with as much attention and humility, as if I had been worthy to teach him. God gave me words, and my love for him gave me earnestness, and my heart prayed for a blessing as I spoke. It was wonderful how soon he embraced the Scripture offer of a Saviour. I was enabled to point out passages in the Bible which seemed to meet the very longings of his soul. He never thought he would recover. However he did every thing that was prescribed. His time was spent in preparing for another world, and to his friends who visited him, he spoke very openly. Many an officer left him with looks of thoughtfulness seldom seen on their countenances; but Colonel Aberley had such a noble frank manner, that every thing he said was attended to. The last two days he spent almost entirely in prayer. He said to me, "I know now, Cameron, that son-like confidence in God, which so much struck me in your prayers." He then condescended to give me his hand, and said, "We are all sons of God, my friend, through faith in Christ Jesus—that Lord whom I have known so late, yet who has manifested Himself to me so as to overcome all the cavils of an ignorant and unbelieving heart. Once I would not have credited what I now feel. Oh! how lovely, how gentle are those characters in which our Lord and Master represents himself as coming to call us to another world—"The Son of Man—the Bridegroom!" How cold, how useless in the time of need—what an empty nothing is that, which in the vanity of our reasoning, we call natural religion. How altogether suitable! How altogether adorable the religion of my Lord, my Savior, my God and portion forever!"—(EDW. GER. and ANNA are much moved. Mr. LORNTON takes the Bible and leans over it.)

EDW. (*Addressing Mr. Ross.*) How wonderful is all this! How near it brings us to an unseen world—to God, the hearer and answerer of prayer! How real is His presence every where! How similar the overpowering, the subduing effect of His adorable grace in every soul! My beloved Father—it seems as if he was at this moment present with us. Oh! may God enable me to act as if he were.

Mr. Ross. (*Earnestly.*) He will. he will. He leaves no work that he begins unfinished.

EDW. (*Goes forward towards the people, who gather round him.*) My dear friends, in speaking to you to-day, I have felt conscious that in declaring my own determination to devote my life to the service of God, you could not feel much confidence in my resolutions, young, and untried, and full of faults as you know me to

be. (*Cries of "We only know your goodness and kindness."*) Hear me without interruption, my friends. I have now an example to offer you, that you will think worthy of following. You loved my Father. (*People "Ay, as our own souls."*) Look at this Bible. Your master, when he came to die, felt that he needed from this to learn how. See, it is all marked with his own dying hand. (*The people gather close to look, and exclaim mournfully, "His own hand!"*) Yes, his own hand. I shall read you some of the passages—here is one. "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved, but the name of Jesus." I have told you that in this name is my only hope; but here is my father's own dying hand subscribing to the same single trust. You know the strict propriety of his life. If any man could have approached God in his own righteousness, he might. (*People, "Ay, at an earthly bar, none could have laid a fault to his charge."*) Yes, my friends, but when about to appear at an heavenly bar, even he found that he needed One to stand between him and the judgment he deserved there; and which of us then need hope? (*People, "None, none."*) Then I trust you will all flee for refuge to that Saviour to whom he trusted the salvation of his soul. I will read another marked passage from this Bible. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." And this, "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." These are some of the passages of this word of life, on which my father rested his hopes for eternity. My friends, shall we not follow his steps? This is my own Decision, in the strength of God my Saviour. It is the Decision, in the same strength, of all my family. (*The people are much moved.*) Mr. Ross, you are our guide and teacher—you will, I am sure also, be our faithful reprove. Now, my dear Sir, before we separate, will you entreat God for us, that he may enable us to obey his most gracious command, to believe in his Son for the salvation of our souls; and to awaken all of us to the vast importance of that which Christ himself calls "the one thing needful." Pray, my dear Sir, that none of us may venture again "to give sleep to our eyes till we have found a place for the Lord in our hearts."

(*Mr. Ross and Edward, &c. take off their hats, while Mr. Ross prays.*) pp. 103--106.

The conclusion of the whole matter is, that

"There can be no half-measures in religion. We are not religious—we know not what it is—we deceive ourselves if we suppose we do, unless it is the subject that occupies our most serious and most anxious thoughts; unless all other subjects seem trifles compared to it; unless we see that we would gain nothing if we gained the whole world, and lost our own souls. We do not love God, and have no authority from Scripture for supposing we do, unless He has a place in our souls and affections different from, and superior to, and altogether unlike the place any human being holds there. We do not know Christ, unless He has so manifested himself to our souls, as to make us feel that He is supreme in all that attracts the love and adoration of the heart and soul: "Whom," as the Apostle says, "having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice, with joy unspeakable and full of glory." pp. 107, 108.

"Profession is not Principle," the other work mentioned, is a more labored production of our author's pen. The writer has here undertaken to expose the unsoundness of the religion with which "the wise men of this world" content themselves, when they rest in a mere intellectual assent to the authority of Revelation. He has set himself to awaken the conscience of a philosophic moralist; to remove the objections against vital religion, which arise in the mind of such a person; to ferret out his errors, and trace them to their principles; and to detect the fallacies with which, as we must fear, many an acute mind has reasoned itself into practical scepticism and final ruin. The design is a worthy one, and we think our author has executed it with a good degree of success. If in unravelling the subtleties, to which even men who call themselves honest, will betake themselves, rather than embrace the simplicity of the Gospel, which demands only the heart, our author has sometimes mistaken the exact point, "where wit and reason fail," he is by no means the first who has done so. We doubt whether he had settled in his own mind a sufficiently clear conception of the na-

ture of the obstacle which prevents a sinner from returning to obedience. There appears in him, and more in some other late writers on that side of the water, a strong tendency to represent it as a physical impossibility; as if man was not made with powers adequate to the exercise of holy affections. They do not indeed design to exonerate the impenitent from blame; but they rather weaken the hold which the truth ought to have on his conscience.

We have said thus much, because that when we commend a work, as we do this, we do not wish to make ourselves responsible for all that it contains. We are aware that it is no easy task to avoid both Scylla and Charybdis, in stating and *applying* the doctrines of grace. And the inherent difficulty is greatly increased, by the changing nature of the errors to be combatted, and the deceitful character of the heart which is to be wrought upon. We will not absolutely assert that it is possible to exhibit these truths in a manner sufficiently impressive and convincing, and yet to leave no room for perversion, on the one hand or the other. Yet we do feel that a more thorough investigation of the subject would help such a mind as our author's, to meet some difficulties better than he has done.

It will be easily apprehended, that the object in view obliged the writer to enter, in a measure, into some of the most difficult points of theology. There may therefore, be in this volume more passages, which a superficial reader will be likely to pass over. Yet he has continued to imitate scripture so well, in illustrating the practical bearing of divine truth, that we think no one, who has the least spark of the spirit of inquiry about him, will fail to derive entertainment and instruction from a careful perusal.

The principal speaker is a gentleman of fortune and intelligence, by the name of Howard; who has, by

ill health, and the loss of a beloved child, been led to feel the necessity, and to experience the comforts of real religion. His friend Conway, a sort of *Christian deist*, hears of the change, and visits him with anxious curiosity, for the purpose of learning its nature. The few incidents of the story are pretty naturally interwoven in the conversations which take place during this visit. The wife, and son, and daughter of Howard, are introduced into the dialogue, as *dramatis personæ*, rather, it should seem, for the purpose of giving life to the picture, than as contributing essentially to the main design. The history of Arthur Howard, another son, now deceased, makes an interesting episode. The whole story is briefly this. Arthur, who was a cripple but possessed of a cultivated and acute mind, had been led to renounce a hollow-hearted profession of Christianity, and to embrace the truth in the love of it, through the persuasions of his young friend Travers. During Mr. Howard's sickness, before alluded to, his attention is turned to his soul, and he sees something how he stood related to a holy God. This awakens deep anxiety, and Arthur becomes his father's spiritual monitor. Arthur finally communicates to his father a narrative of his own conversion, and of the patient and judicious course through which Travers had led him. The truth made a deep impression upon the mind of Mr. H. The pious and happy death of Arthur, which took place soon after, was the blessed means of deciding his resolution, in favor of religion. He then endeavours to promote the spiritual interest of his other children. Charles, with tender feelings, but a proud heart, rejects the truth. Eliza receives it with meekness, and obeys it in the love of it. Travers becomes acquainted with her character, and offers her his hand, which is accepted. It is just at this time that the intercourse takes place between Howard and Conway, which

makes up the body of the work. In answer to the inquiries of the latter, Howard enters into a minute account of what had passed in his own mind; and labors, with great candor and faithfulness, to justify his religion, in the view of his philosophical friend. And not only does he give a reason of his own hope, but he endeavours to do it in such a manner, as shall establish equal conviction, excite corresponding emotions, and secure similar resolutions for God, in his companion. They had been old and intimate friends, and their views had been the same respecting their relations to God. The following extract gives a view of what had been their religion; so different from the service which God requires, so opposite to the religion of sinners.

How. Do not puzzle yourself, my dear Conway, to discover what it is about me that leads you to believe, you can scarcely tell why, that I am changed,—that I am not exactly what I was when we last met. The truth is, Conway, that I am not. You shall know all respecting this change, that I myself know. It is not only in my opinions, it is infinitely more in my feelings; and in both, most particularly so with regard to the Supreme Being, and the relation which man bears to him. How often have you and I, dear Conway, compared our opinions and feelings on those most important subjects. When we last met, we were nearly of the same mind regarding them. With what composure have we at times traced the character of the God of our conceptions, after having admired the wonderful order of his heavens, and the exalted sublimity, and touching beauty of the works of nature.

Con. Yes, Howard; and why not with composure? Is not a calm and rational state of mind the most suitable, when attempting to conceive or to trace the character of the Supreme Being?

How. Yes, Conway. Certainly we ought to trace the attributes of that Being from whom we received existence, and with whom we expect to pass eternity, with every power of our souls deeply and solemnly engaged, and as free as possible from all distraction. But what I wished to recal to your remembrance, was the remark we so often made, in the days of our warmest emotions, Conway, that while nature was before us,—while we gazed on the mingled grandeur, and

softness, and tenderness, of a glorious sunset, for instance, or autumn moon-light, we did not reason,—we loved, we adored. It was when the impression was past that we began to reason. We considered the result of those reasonings very beneficial to us, and those moments of rapture which led to them as the purest and sweetest of our lives, and I doubt not they did tend to calm and elevate our minds. But, Conway, did we after all know God? or did we in truth ever worship him?

Con. Did you not say this moment, Howard, that, on viewing the sublimity and beauty of God's creation, we loved, we adored?

How. Yes, Conway; our hearts were filled to painfulness with feelings of love and adoration, but on what or whom did we bestow those full affections? We gazed on the loveliness of creation, till our hearts panted to find and love its Creator,—but did we find him? We retired and became calm; and recollecting the beautiful order of the heavens, and the profusion of charm that was displayed through all nature, we saw dimly, that he who created and sustained the greatness, and minuteness, and loveliness, and order of the whole, must himself be inconceivably great, and inconceivably wise, and inconceivably lovely,—and we felt that in our natures we were at an inconceivable distance from him; and he passed from our thoughts as altogether inconceivable, while we believed, that amidst the wonderful vastness of his providence, we, as a part, and in connexion with other intelligent parts of a great machinery, would be sustained in existence till we came to the moment when we must submit to the common fate, and pass through death—we hoped to immortality; but the nature of that immortality we guessed at too dimly, to rest our thoughts upon it,—at all events it would be happy to the virtuous.

Con. Well, Howard, I know not that by reasoning we can approach any nearer to God. But, my friend, you speak as if we had actually denied the truth of Christianity; now, in a modified sense, neither of us ever rejected the Bible as the guide of our hopes,—and its morality, at least that of the New Testament, though perhaps impracticable, we considered beautifully pure,—and its Founder—

How. Do not proceed, Conway. Pardon me for interrupting you, but I know your opinions; they were mine, and it is in these opinions I am utterly changed. Those I formerly held, now appear to me tremendously guilty. You are offended, Conway; but I must speak to you, my friend, dear to me as my own soul, what now appears to me truth as clear as day. Conway, we have both erred, dreadfully erred. My letters to you have betrayed the change in my soul. Oh! if you knew

how I have attempted to express my meaning in those letters so as not to shock you, or seem to you a madman!—and now I have almost convinced you that I am one." pp 9—12.

The particular sin, which seems to have made the deepest impression upon Howard, is that of ingratitude. It would be as reasonable to find fault with others, for not having eyes like our own, as to decide against the reality of their conversion, because their views of guilt do not entirely correspond with our preconceived notions, or our religious experience. It is easy to conceive that there may be a great difference, as minds are so different. Thus a high minded man shall be chiefly affected with a view of what is base in his conduct, a man of scrupulous honesty, by what is dishonest, and the tender conscience with the guilt of violating God's holy Law.—"By their fruits ye shall know them." And we know that fruits, the same in kind, have yet endless varieties, in appearance and flavour, according to the trees on which they grew.

Howard proceeds to describe the process by which he was brought to feel that there was something in religion which he did not possess; a peace, an intercourse with God, and a confidence in his fatherly care, which he had never yet enjoyed.

"*How.* To me it appeared perfectly just reasoning to conclude, that I was in a very deep degree guilty of ingratitude to God. It appeared also clear to me, that I had acted like a fool in superciliously neglecting, as I had done, the only book in the world, whose pretensions to inspiration had borne the test of the strictest examinations of ages; and on which, those men whose characters I revered as the wisest and best the world ever saw, had rested their hopes of immortality. Nor did I myself know of one single instance where candid examination had ended in a different result.

Con. My dear Howard, I cannot help doubting that last assertion.

How. I only say, Conway, that I never knew of its ending differently. Amongst all those with whom I have conversed intimately on the subject of religion, I have never met with one who even pretended to know the Bible thoroughly, but those

who are guided by it. On the contrary, it is as general to despise the knowledge, as the belief of it. I know men, indeed, who, from early education, are pretty well acquainted with the language of the Bible, and who can quote it fluently for bad purposes; yet even they, I now find, are ignorant of the general scope of scripture, and the connexion of the words they quote,—or if not ignorant, they shamefully pervert their obvious meaning. I appeal to yourself, Conway, when you and I last met, though we termed ourselves Christians, and had partaken of Christian rites to qualify ourselves for holding civil offices, did we know the Bible?

Con. I cannot say that I am intimately acquainted with the Bible; yet I have read it through more than once, and often read portions of it on a Sunday,—besides, you know I frequently attend church with my family, where I have so often heard it read, that it seems quite familiar to me. I cannot, however, pretend to be master of its contents.

How. I understand you, Conway, from my own experience. We hear detached portions of scripture in church, till we become intimate with its peculiar language, while we have scarcely admitted one of its precepts or doctrines into our minds.

Con. Perhaps so, Howard but proceed.

How. Well, my friend, you know me well enough to believe that I would no longer continue in this state of ignorance, at least of the Bible, which it was in my power to examine. As to my ingratitude, I prayed to God to forgive me. When I sought, however, for a plea to urge, that I might obtain forgiveness, I could find none. I said, 'Merciful God, forgive me, for hitherto I have not been aware of the guilt of this ingratitude;' but why have you not been aware? was a question I could not answer, but by going a step further in acknowledging guilt,—'because I have been so much occupied with thy gracious gifts, that I have forgotten Thee the giver.' I felt that I had no excuse to plead. I had from my youth been my own master. Time for investigation, and a disposition for research on other subjects, had been gifts of God bestowed on me. How then could I be excusable in having found God himself the only subject of no interest. Conway, I cannot describe to you the utter change which was produced in my soul by this strong feeling of self-condemnation. I had been accustomed to regard myself as one above the common level in character; but all appeared a vain dream, when I discovered that I had been a fool on the only subject in the world which is in reality of any lasting importance. In those moments, Conway,

our speculations regarding God seemed to have as much resemblance to the truth, as the setting sun has to death,—the one is a beautiful image,—the other an awful reality. I felt as if I had brought myself near to God by my heartfelt attempts at thanksgiving; and the idea of his presence was awful to me beyond expression. I had always, I supposed, believed in the omnipresence of God. I now felt what really believing it was. I felt continually, as it were, surrounded, and wrapt in the presence of One, so pure in holiness, that I shrunk from my own character in comparison, as from what in His sight must be pollution,—One so incomprehensible in the wisdom and vastness of his ways, as to make me feel the utter, inexpressible insignificance of every pursuit that did not lead to the knowledge of his character and will. I longed to read the Bible, for I felt that the little I knew of its language suited to my feelings, could alone express them,—such as these words of Job, ‘I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee, wherefore I abhor myself, and repent—’

Con. What an expression, Howard! abhor yourself! Can you be serious?

How. If you recollect the character of Job, Conway, you will allow that mine never could have borne a comparison with his; yet these were his feelings on receiving a clearer manifestation of the character of God, than he had enjoyed before his days of adversity. It is ignorance, and inexperience of the vividness, the at times appalling vividness, with which the Spirit of God manifests truth to the soul, that makes us regard such language as extravagant. You are silent, Conway, but you look dissatisfied. Do you now, (*smiling,*) think me mad?

Con. My dear Howard, did you, at the time you experienced those vivid impressions you describe, imagine yourself under the influence of supernatural agency?

How. No, my dear friend. Such an idea had never then entered my mind. I have since learned from Scripture, to ascribe to the Spirit of God all manifestation of religious truth to the soul.

Con. Proceed then, my friend, I intreat you.

How. Well, Conway, I wished to read the Bible. I was then, however, still unable to sit up above a very short time, and my poor Emilia continued to watch me with an anxiety which proved to me that she did not consider me out of danger. When I begged her to bring a Bible to me she became as pale as death. Only she and Arthur were in the room with me. He instantly started up, and clasping his hands together, rung for his servant, and hastened out of the room. ‘You feel worse,

Howard,’ said Emilia, attempting to appear composed. I assured her I did not, but she would not believe me; so unusual is it for us who call ourselves Christians, to consult, when in health, the source of our pretended faith. Emilia gazed on me with looks of apprehension, as if the time of our separation must be near. I felt that I had not strength for the exertion that a real avowal of my feelings would have occasioned; so soothed, and rallied her, till at last she was persuaded to leave me alone with a Bible which Arthur had brought to me. On opening this Bible, I found written on a blank leaf at the beginning, ‘Arthur Howard, my first read Bible, though styling myself a Christian, and in my twentieth year.’ So my poor boy has also discovered his criminal ignorance, thought I. Or rather your criminal neglect, said my now vividly awakened conscience; for I had never seriously attempted to instruct, or lead him to inform himself on the subject of religion. Poor Arthur’s reflection on himself spoke volumes to me. All my other children had been equally neglected. They had all, you know, Conway, been educated in the observance of the forms of religion; but further I had taken little charge on the subject, thinking it a part of their education in which their mother would succeed better than I. This unfortunate boy, who, by the carelessness of those to whom we had entrusted him, had been rendered an object of painful anxiety to his friends, and unable from his childhood to participate in any of the pleasures suited to his age; and who, from extreme sensibility, shunned society, in which, he said, every eye changed its expression when it turned to him,—this dear boy, for any thing I had taught him, was as little fitted for another world as for this. While my heart condemned me, it was at the same time inexpressibly softened; and though I felt unworthy to raise my thoughts to God, still I adored his goodness in thus having been a father to my neglected boy. Arthur’s Bible had many passages marked.

Con. (*Moved.*) Poor fellow! I am glad it was so.

How. Aye, Conway; but why so? Why is it, that when those we loved are gone to another state, we never think they were too religious, but feel the more secure of their being happy, the more certain we are of their having devoted themselves to God in this world?

Con. It is so, Howard; but go on.

How. I turned up several of those passages marked by Arthur. One arrested my attention. It was this,—‘Acquaint thyself with God, and be at peace.’ Now, Conway, what do you think is the meaning of that passage?

Con. I think the meaning pretty plain, Howard. We have only to recollect the

wretched superstitions of Heathen nations,—the miserable parent sacrificing his own offspring,—or the poor dark-minded devotee, with a sensitive conscience, but ignorant of the true God, attempting to propitiate his fancied deity, by tortures and blood,—we have only to recollect these, to enable us to understand how the knowledge of the true God imparts peace to the soul. That passage, I think, bears the stamp of inspiration.

How. I thought as you do, Conway, when I read it, and I also understood it in the same way; but on turning to some other passages, I began to doubt whether I really understood this,—at least the meaning I attached to the words did not seem to penetrate farther than the surface when compared with such passages as these,—‘God is my strength,—my shield,—my salvation,—Lord, lift on us the light of thy countenance,—as the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God!—my soul thirsteth for the living God.’

Con. My dear Howard, that is eastern language and metaphor?

How. Supposing it is so, what is the meaning of the metaphor? To what does it allude?

Con. To that state of mind which you yourself described. Howard, when you said your heart had at times been filled to painfulness with love and adoration towards the Creator of the beautiful works of nature which surrounded you.

How. No, my dear Conway, the words I have quoted from the Bible, express the longings of the soul after a known and felt enjoyment. ‘My refuge, my hope, my joy,’ are not expressions ever used by those who know God only in his works. They are used by those who know, and have experienced, that there is such a thing as real intercourse between God and the human soul, on this side the grave.

Con. And do you, Howard, really believe that there is?

How. I do, Conway, most firmly. I know it is considered mere enthusiasm to believe this truth, though it is plainly revealed in the Scriptures. I once thought it was so myself, though there was to me a something so lovely in the dream, as I supposed it, in which religious enthusiasts lived, that I never felt the same scorn for them that I saw others do.

Con. I see nothing lovely in religious enthusiasm. How many poor ignorant creatures have had their brains crazed by such fancies, and then given, in their vulgar language, their disgusting dreams to the world.

How. Nothing that is the production of a vulgar mind can be relished by a refined one, I confess. It was not from such productions I learnt the sentiments of

those I deemed enthusiasts. It was from the writings of Augustine particularly, and others of a later date, who are of the same sentiments, in all of which I found this firm belief in a felt communion of soul with God. But I shall proceed in my own mind’s history. After I had read a good many of the passages marked by Arthur, I became so exhausted, that I was obliged to lie down, and soon fell asleep. When I awoke, I perceived that Arthur had come unheard into my room, and was seated close to my bed. He leant upon it, his cheek rested on his hand, and his eyes raised earnestly to heaven. You remember, Conway, how sweet and expressive his countenance was; at that moment it really was heavenly. He seemed as if his spirit held intercourse with an adored, but invisible intelligence. For some moments I did not interrupt him, but watched his looks. They expressed adoration, and earnest intreaty, mingled with a softness of confiding love that filled his eyes with tears.

‘Arthur!’ said I, at last, ‘who is there present here, besides you and I?’

He looked at me, rather alarmed at the strangeness of the question, as I lay so easily to perceive there was no other person present.

‘I have been watching your looks, my dear boy,’ said I. ‘You seemed to feel the presence of some loved but invisible being.’

He blushed deeply, and seemed embarrassed, and hesitated for a moment: then recovering himself, ‘Yes, my dear father,’ he replied, firmly but with much feeling, ‘my soul did seek to feel the presence of Him, whom having not seen, I love; in whom, though now I see him not, yet believing, I rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.’

‘Arthur,’ asked I, with much interest, ‘Do you mean Almighty God by those expressions?’

‘I do, Sir,’ replied he, ‘but I believe I do not exactly mean your idea when you say, ‘Almighty God.’ I mean God the Son,—he by whom alone we can have access to God the Father.’” pp. 17—25

He then goes on to relate the instructions which he received from his son Arthur. The Christian fidelity, mingled with filial tenderness, exercised by this young man, is truly admirable, and worthy of imitation. So is his great caution, not to go beyond the scriptures in his efforts at the removal of difficulties.

We give the following passage, for the purpose of making a remark on what we deem a defect in the argument.

How. Jesus Christ sums up all the divine law in these two requirements, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself.' And are not these two requirements as much calculated to secure the happiness of man, as they are honorable to the great Lawgiver?

Con. They have surely one defect,—they for whom they are intended, are utterly incapable of obeying them.

How. And whence that incapacity, Conway? Why is it, that while we profess to believe that God is supremely worthy of our love, we cannot love him supremely? And while we admire his beautifully simple and just rule, by which he instructs man to secure the happiness of his brother man, that we cannot obey it?

Con. To answer that question, my friend, I must proceed step by step to account for that which has never yet been accounted for,—the origin of evil.

How. No, my dear Conway, that would only lead you from the point. If we would submit to the teaching of him, who we profess to believe is the only wise,—the only omniscient, and whose teaching is fully confirmed by our own experience, we would believe that the cause of this incapacity is the aversion of our hearts to the purity of his nature and laws. We do not see, with the clearness that he sees, this state of our feelings, because we never experienced that fulness of love for him,—the all-perfect, all-lovely,—which he intended at our creation should constitute the full satisfaction and happiness of our natures, and with which, when he contrasts the present state of our feelings, he terms it plainly 'enmity;' and we, full of self-love as we are, will allow that, at times at least, we feel a distaste for thoughts of God, an impatience under his moral restraints, and a disposition to forget his existence, and to act as if we ourselves were the end of our own being.

Con. And how is all this to be prevented, Howard? How are we to change these hearts, and restore them to that state for which they were intended?

How. That is the only inquiry of any importance, amongst all the inquiries of the busy human mind; because, till it is answered, every other pursuit is mere vanity,—mere trifling on the brink of an eternity of separation from God. The answer of God to this question, throws light on all that is of any moment for us to know on this side the grave.

Con. And what is the answer of God to this question?

How. It is this,—he has himself undertaken to renew us by his Spirit, after the image of Christ, if we will only bend our stubborn souls, and ask him to do so.

You look disappointed, Conway." pp. 38—40.

The passage contains a pretty good view of the *ground* or reason of our incapacity to keep the commandments of God. We only wish our author had shown the nature of the incapacity. We believe it is simply a want of will, an unwillingness to give up things that cannot be enjoyed in consistence with that Law. So that in fact "the cause of this incapacity" is nothing different from the incapacity itself. The use of the terms, incapable, and incapacity, and the like, is so liable to mislead, or at least, to afford an occasion for perversion and cavilling, that too much care can hardly be exercised, in giving prominence to the fact, that man alone stands in the way of his own obedience, and that if he is finally lost, it will be *wholly* his own fault. The passage likewise leads to another remark. We do not fully understand Howard's last answer. It seems to imply that, in his view, the renewing influences of the Holy Spirit, or *regenerating* grace, is a conditional gift to unrenowned sinners which is *promised*, "if we will bend our stubborn souls, and ask him to do so." Our difficulty is in determining the state or character of a sinner, in this attitude of asking. Is he regenerate, or unregenerate, when he "bends his stubborn soul?" Is not the struggle between the world and God in fact over, when he comes to this point? If he has really humbled himself under the mighty hand of God, he has done what he was commanded to do; he has exercised Christian humility.

The next extract shows the folly of that miserable refuge of lies to which it is so fashionable to resort, by those who reject the atonement of Christ. The idea that God no longer requires obedience, but is *satisfied* with something short of it is the most wretched delusion that can be thought of.

Con. But, my dear Howard, do not even the strictest religionists allow that it will be by the sincerity, not by the perfection of our obedience, that we shall be judged at the last day?

How. No, Conway; that is one of those glosses in explaining scripture of which I spoke, and one which has completely established itself as an undeniable religious truth, while there is not a shadow of ground for it in the Bible. Can you, Conway, recollect any passage in scripture, which implies that our omniscient Judge will accept of a sincere but unsuccessful attempt to obey, in the place of exact obedience?

Con. Does not Christ himself make an excuse for his disciples, when, instead of watching with him, as he had requested in his hour of agony, they fell asleep? He said, in pity of their weakness, and aware of their sincerity, 'The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.' I have always admired the gentleness and magnanimity of these words, at such a time.

How. And yet, Conway, if you will examine the passage which is constantly produced in favor of your opinion, you will find that you have been admiring an explanation of our Lord's words which they cannot bear. We shall read the passage as St. Mark has it; (*reads*) 'And Jesus cometh, and findeth them sleeping, and saith unto Peter, Simon, sleepest thou?' (Why so pointedly address Peter, and not James and John, unless in allusion to his having so confidently declared that he was ready to suffer and die with his Lord?) 'Couldst thou not watch one hour? Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation; the spirit truly is ready, but the flesh is weak.' Is this an excuse? Is it not rather a most serious and gracious warning, to which, had the sincere but self-confident Peter attended, he might have been saved from the—weakness, will you call it? I must say—crime of denying his Master an hour after. There is, besides, no other instance which can possibly be understood as you understand this. Christ never extenuates the faults of his disciples; on the contrary, he always reproves them; and had he done otherwise, he would not have been, as he was, the teacher and the example of the most perfect holiness." pp. 43—45.

We now come to Arthur's narrative of his own conversion, which he drew up for his father. We give the following account of his first interview with Travers. It had been brought about by their friends, in hopes that Arthur's acute mind would be able to detect the fallacy of the arguments by which Travers was continually endeavouring to awaken their consciences, and persuade them to seek the salvation of their souls.

I believe we both felt a little embarrassed on finding ourselves *tête-à-tête*, as each was perfectly aware of the anxious wishes of Mrs. Travers and my aunt. Travers spoke first.

'I believe, Mr. Howard,' said he smiling, and reddening as he spoke, 'our friends expect and hope that you and I shall commence our acquaintance by making war on each others opinions on a certain subject. I know for whom conquest is ardently wished; therefore, as one against many, I think I shall take what advantage I can, and begin, by plainly asking you of what religion you are?'

'Of what religion?' repeated I, smiling in return; 'of the Christian religion, I presume.'

'Then we are on plain ground. A Christian must mean a disciple of Jesus Christ, and that is all I aim to be; and if I misunderstand any of the doctrines taught by my divine Master, or disobey any of his precepts, I most earnestly desire to be better informed, and to be more faithful in future.'

I said that he had indeed gained an advantage over me,—that I had spoken without reflection,—and that I perceived I had an opponent with whom I must define terms.

'Then, may I beg of you to define your idea of a Christian?'

I hesitated.—'Why, a Christian is now a national appellation. It was, I believe, in that sense I used the term.'

'May I ask you to define its meaning in that sense?'

'Why, it is opposed to the ignorance and grossness of Heathenism and Mahometanism. A Christian in this sense, particularly a Protestant, means a person whose mind is perfectly freed from superstition, who regards himself as a free and intelligent being, and who worships that true God, whose character is, in his mind, freed from those dreadful attributes in which ignorance and superstition clothe it; and this Being he boldly ventures to worship, according to the dictates of his own conscience.'

'And where is Christ, in this system of Christianity?' asked Travers, gently.

'He was the Founder of the system.'

'How?'

'He visited this world to reveal more perfectly the character of the God of mercy and benevolence to mankind; and himself to show them an example of perfect virtue.'

'Do national Christians consider themselves bound to follow that example?' asked he, looking earnestly at me as he spoke.

'Certainly; following that example, I might have said, was the definition of a Christian.'

‘In what do they follow it?’

On Travers asking this question, I recollected what my aunt had said of him,—that he did not believe there were half-a-dozen people in England who would get to heaven. ‘Do you expect,’ asked I, ‘that imperfect creatures can follow a perfect model? As it is, was the standard of morals ever so high in any country, as it now is in this? Are not the very purest morals of Christianity, those to which the voice of the whole nation appeals, when, in any controversy, its voice is heard?’

Travers smiled.—‘True; you have described the effect that the knowledge of true Christianity has upon a nation. Every conscience bends to its authority, as what the light of truth there says, would be right and just in all. You have traced this universal knowledge of morality, in this country, to its true source,—the knowledge of Christianity; but you have not answered my question.’

‘I cannot answer it otherwise. If making the morality taught by Jesus Christ, the morality of a whole nation, does not constitute a Christian nation, I know not what would.’

‘Let us leave these generalities,’ said Travers, ‘in which we forget individual responsibility, and allow me to ask one question. Do you suppose all those men, who receive the sacrament to qualify themselves for civil offices, believe in the doctrine which that ordinance represents, and which they profess to believe by appearing there?’

‘I certainly do not.’

‘And is there any part of the New Testament, which would not condemn that appearance as hypocrisy, deceit, and fraud?’

I could not say there was.

‘Can men who do this, really be disciples of Jesus Christ?’

I was silent.

‘Can they, in sincerity, worship a pure and holy God? To what, or whom, can they internally direct the excuse they make, when they thus perjure themselves? If they really in heart adored a holy God, they would not dare thus to disregard his omniscient and omnipresent holiness. If they worship a Being who they think will not condemn such falsehood, they worship,—not the God of Christianity, but the Satan, whom Christianity warns us against as the god of this world.’

‘You state the matter too strongly,’ said I, half displeased; ‘I know men, who would spurn from them with indignation the very idea of hypocrisy and fraud, who yet thus qualify themselves for office without any scruple.’

‘And without believing in that atonement represented in the sacrament?’

‘Yes; without being able to believe any thing so incomprehensible.’

‘Are they Christians, then, either in faith or morals?’

I felt that I was becoming warm, and remained silent; and Travers immediately changed the subject, and did not resume it again during that visit.” pp. 90—94.

Another extract is designed to illustrate the cautions and gradual manner, in which these philosophic minds receive light upon religious subjects. The living reality of Scott’s “Force of Truth,” still more strikingly exemplifies, that religion is not, in fact, an irrational thing, but is rejected by philosophic minds, on other grounds.

After the perusal of Arthur’s narrative and some fragments of his writings, Howard and Conway resume their conversation. We give a short extract here, as an example of Christian faithfulness in pressing truth upon the conscience.

“*How.* I did not say that the objects of faith were simple, or easily understood. On the contrary, I have said that scripture itself declares their great mysteriousness; but I say, that believing them saves the soul.

Con. But, my dear Howard, belief is not a thing in our power. Belief is an effect, a consequence.

How. An effect, or consequence, of what?

Con. (*Smiling.*) I know to what that question leads.

How. All I wish is, to induce you to do that which will produce this effect, this consequence. If you fairly and candidly do your part, if you examine your own mind, and discover what those objections are, which lead you to but half credit the Bible, and then listen with candor to the answers which learned, and wise, and good men, have given to these objections, I shall not fear the result: and if, at the same time, you examine scripture itself with the degree of faith you already possess—

Con. (*Interrupting him.*) The faith I already possess! Do you think I already possess any of that which you call faith?

How. My most dear Conway, you do not possess the faith which will save you, but you possess that which, if alone, will condemn you. You believe in God, yet you make scarcely any attempt to know his character or will. You believe that Jesus Christ came into the world to teach us that will, yet you take no pains to make yourself acquainted with the character or office of that ‘Teacher sent from God.’ You half believe the scriptures are inspir-

ed, yet you rest satisfied to remain half ignorant of them. To what, then, my friend, can your belief lead, but to make you criminal in the sight of that God, whose word, and whose heavenly Messenger, you have thus slighted? Faith, without effects, according to St. James, 'is dead.' It is nothing, or worse than nothing. Have I said more than the truth, Conway? for I have been describing my own state of mind when I last saw you." pp. 144, 145.

The conclusion shows Conway, fully convinced of the reality of experimental religion, and of the desirableness and necessity of a change of heart as a preparative for heaven, and *almost* persuaded to be a christian. May our readers be, not almost, but altogether, such as they will wish to be, when they stand before Christ!

How. But now, my dear Conway, it is twelve o'clock, and I fear I must leave you.

Con. I must, then, hear of your other children when we again meet. I trust you will soon see them all of one mind with Emma and yourself.

How. And you also, Conway, do you wish the same for yourself?

Con. From my soul, I do.

How. And you will 'seek, that you may find.'

Con. I will.

How. Conway, there is one hour every night, after all my household have retired, that I spend alone; or rather, I should say, with God. Will you meet me at that hour to-night, and spend it with me, seeking the same presence?

Con. With you?

How. Yes, my dearest friend. We have had intimate union of soul in many pursuits,—why shrink from it in this?

Con. I do not shrink from union of soul with you, Howard; but this seems so strange,—yet I shall meet you; whatever follows.

How. Farewell, then, for a little. My family will again suppose I mean to monopolize you entirely. Let us go to them." p. 162.

Literary and Philosophical Intelligence.

The annual Commencement at Hampden Sidney College, was held on the 23d of September. The degree of Bachelor of Arts was conferred on seven young gentlemen, and the degree of Master of Arts on nine, alumni of the College. James Marsh, A. M. was elected Professor of Languages and Belles Lettres.

The University of Georgia held its Commencement on the 4th of August. Ten young gentlemen received the degree of A. B. and ten the degree of A. M. The degree of LL. D. was conferred on the Hon. William H. Crawford, Secretary of the U. S. Treasury.

At the annual Commencement of Nassau Hall, held on the 29th of September; the degree of A. B. was conferred on 47, and the degree of A. M. on 13. The degree of LL. D. was conferred on the Hon. Jonas Platt.

Measures have been taken for the erection of a Monument to General Washington, in Philadelphia. The citizens of Camden, S. C. have determined to erect a monument to the memory of Baron de Kalb, a Major General in the U. S. Revolutionary Army, who fell in battle near

that place. General La Fayette has been invited to lay the corner stone of both these monuments, as well as of that to be erected on Bunker Hill.

One hundred and sixty coloured persons of both sexes were to sail from New-York for Hayti on the 19th of October. Six vessels at Philadelphia, one at Port Elizabeth, one at Alexandria, and several others at Baltimore, are on the eve of sailing for the same destination. It is calculated that between three and four thousand of these persons will leave the United States in a few days, and that every fortnight additional numbers will be shipped off under the direction of President Boyer's agent, who pays the expense of their transmission by authority of the Haytien government. About 200 sailed in September from Philadelphia.

The Board of Managers of the American Colonization Society, have determined to send this fall if possible, two vessels with emigrants to Liberia.

Some intimation of the state of the Jews in Germany is furnished by the

fact that at Wiemar, in Hesse Darmsdat, an edict has been issued by which they are rendered admissible to the public gymnasia and the University. It is added that they are even authorized to intermarry with Christians, on certain conditions.

In 1789, the number of Roman Catholics in England was 69,376. In 1817, they had increased to 500,000. There were but *three* Roman Catholic schools of any note in England in 1781. It is now said that there are upwards of *fifty*.

A London paper mentions that a German residing in Japan, is writing a treatise on the Natural History of that country, which is expected to convey much interesting information.

Alterations have commenced at Windsor Castle which are expected to employ 600 men for five years.

Windsor Park embraces a circumference of nearly 27 miles—and the private rides now solely confined to the royal retinue, from their mazy turnings and wind-

ings, make the circuit greater than even 27 miles.

Very gratifying proofs of the general intelligence and enterprise of the Swedish nation are furnished by the progress of their internal improvements. During the past year, six canals were begun, one of which is 36 Swedish miles in length, and employs 2,791 workmen. Two rivers were cleared and rendered navigable, so that lumber from their almost interminable forests, may now readily be transferred to any part of Europe. Eleven hundred colonists were transplanted to the forests of Dalecarlia, which they are cutting down and settling. Large marshes were drained, and converted to excellent land. A large building for a Library was erected at Upsal, at an expense of 50,000 rix-dollars. Six hundred and forty-two thousand rix-dollars were expended on repairing of cities, aqueducts, bridges, &c. Three great public roads were finished, leading across the mountains of Norway. Much has also been done to rebuild and repair their fortresses.

List of New Publications.

RELIGIOUS.

The Faithful Minister's Monument. A Sermon preached at the funeral of the Rev. John Giles, senior pastor of the second Presbyterian church and society in Newburyport, Oct. 1, 1824. By Samuel Porter Williams.

A Sermon delivered before the Hampshire Missionary Society at their annual meeting, Northampton, Aug. 19, 1824, by Rev. Moses Miller, with the 23d Report of the Trustees, and an abstract of the Treasurer's account.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Adam's Latin Grammar, Abridged ; and arranged in a course of Practical Lessons, adapted to the capacity of young learners. By William Russell. A. H. Maltby and Co. New-Haven.

The East Haven Register: in three Parts. Compiled by Stephen Dodd, Pastor of the Congregational Church in East Haven. pp. 200, 12mo. A. H. Maltby and Co. New-Haven.

Elegant Lessons ; or the Young Lady's Preceptor, Being a series of appropriate

Reading Exercises in Prose and Verse ; carefully selected from the most approved authors, for Female Schools and Academies. By Samuel Whiting, Esq. Second Edition.—New-Haven.

A Greek Grammar, principally abridged from that of Buttman, for the use of Schools.

A Summary of the Law and Practice of Real Actions. By Asahel Stearns, Professor of Law in Harvard University.

A Letter to John Lowell, Esq., in Reply to a Publication entitled "Remarks on a Pamphlet printed by the Professors and Tutors of Harvard University, touching their Right to the exclusive Government of that Seminary." By Edward Everett. 8vo. pp. 102.

The Ladies' Companion. Containing, First, Politeness of Manners and Behaviour, from the French of Abbé de Bellegarde. Second, Fenelon on Education. Third, Miss More's Essays. Fourth, Deau Swift's Letter to a Young Lady Newly Married. Fifth, Moore's Fables for the Female Sex, carefully Selected and Revised. By a Lady in the County of Worcester, Mass.

Religious Intelligence.

SANDWICH ISLANDS.

[The following extract from the *Missionary Herald*, after noticing the death of the king and queen of the Sandwich Islands, gives a brief historical sketch of the mission to those Islands.]

The *Missionary Herald* for August, contained a notice of the voyage of the king and queen of the Sandwich Islands to England, with the circumstances attending this extraordinary event. Such a proceeding, in the Ruler of more than 150,000 souls, whatever may be thought to be the degree of their barbarism, we believed could not fail to be followed by important consequences.

Reho-reho no doubt regarded himself as going to a land, where the Sabbath was observed; where were a multitude of churches for Christian worship; where were numerous preachers of the Gospel, in character like the missionaries whom he had left behind; and where the good book of God, the Bible, was every where enjoyed. He probably expected to find whatever the missionaries had recommended to him, as suitable to be adopted in reference to his own people, carried into effect where he was going; and might possibly (for he possessed considerable sagacity,) have designed to remark the aspect of a country, which had been long Christian.

After all the notices respecting the state of religion in England, which this work has heretofore contained, we surely need not stop to give our views of the actual moral and religious condition of that favoured country. But it is easy to see, that this young and inexperienced prince, immediately on his arrival, *might* be thrown into such circumstances, without the fault of the pious people there, that, during his whole stay, he should behold very little of genuine religion, and very much of a demoralizing character. We are not well informed as to his real circumstances, in the few weeks of health which he enjoyed after his arrival; but have reason to believe, that, from political considerations, he was induced to keep himself partially secluded from society, except that he visited the theatre, and the gardens of pleasure.

The queen was the first who was attacked with a pulmonary inflammation; occasioned, in part, it is to be presumed, by her introduction into an atmosphere more cool, and dense, and humid, than she had been accustomed to; and in part, doubtless, by an unpropitious change of regimen, though the style of living in Woahoo, was not wholly unlike to

the English manner. She died early in July. Her character has always been favourably described by the missionaries. Comparing her with her own countrywomen, she must have been an interesting female; and many expectations of good from her influence, have been destroyed by her premature death—for she had scarcely passed the morning of life, when she died.

The king survived her only a few days, and then sunk under the same disorder, brought on, probably, by the same causes, only aggravated by his former dissipation.

The effects of this mysterious providence upon the Sandwich Islands, and upon the mission, are yet to be known. We think, however, that the friends of the mission have no reason for solicitude. The question of a successor cannot, as we can see, involve much difficulty. Though the heir to the kingly authority, a brother of the late king, is young, his title has been often acknowledged, and will not probably be contested. The principal chiefs are all friendly to the mission. And whoever is appointed regent, it may confidently be hoped, that the young prince will be situated where, during his minority, he may enjoy the salutary influence of the missionaries.

The dealings of God towards that mission, have been wonderful from the first. The original missionaries embarked at Boston, before intelligence of any change in those islands had reached this country; and a speedy change was then wholly unlooked for. The brethren expected to find the old king alive, and strongly attached to his idols. They expected to find the morais standing, and the taboo system in full force. They expected to meet a long and determined opposition from a powerful, idolatrous priesthood. They expected to see human victims offered in sacrifice, to behold bloody battles, and to experience many dangers, before idolatry was overthrown. But not one of these expectations was fulfilled! Tamahamaha the 1st. suddenly died, and his son, the late king, on coming to authority, burned the morais, annulled the taboo system, abolished the priesthood, put an end to all sacrifices, and in short, overthrew idolatry. War was the consequence. But before the missionaries arrived, the Providence of God had hushed the islands to peace; and the messengers of salvation found a people without any religion, waiting, as it were, for the law of the true God!

But the missionaries needed a patron: and a patron was provided. Among the natives found wandering on our shores, was the son of Tamoree, king of one of the leeward islands. This son had been taken under the care of the American churches, and was sent home to his father in the same ship that carried the missionaries. This secured the warm friendship and kindest services of Tamoree, which have been continued to this day.

And when some foreigners, anxious to prejudice the natives against the missionaries, endeavoured to make the islanders believe, that, if they listened to such men, they would incur the displeasure of the English nation; and when, also, these foreigners propagated the most erroneous reports, with respect to the influence of missions on the South Sea Islands, with the same object in view; all their machinations were overthrown unexpectedly and at once. God put it into the heart of the British government to purchase a vessel at the distant colony of New South Wales, and send it as a present to the king of the Sandwich Islands. This vessel, on the way to its destined place, touched at the particular island, in the cluster of the Society Islands, where Messrs. Tyerman and Bennet, a deputation from the London Missionary Society, happened then to be. The captain, who had this vessel in charge, offered to take a mission to the Marquesas, by way of the Sandwich Islands; and the brethren resolved that such a mission should be sent. These gentlemen accompanied by a missionary, who had long been on these favoured islands, and one or two of the converted natives, arrived at Woahoo just in the crisis produced by these evil reports. The visitors were Englishmen; they were also from the Society Islands; they came, too, in a vessel belonging to the king of England: and Mr. Ellis, and Auna, and his wife, could speak in the language of the Sandwich Islanders. The false reports were contradicted; the false impressions were removed: and the American Missionaries then rose higher in the general estimation, than they had ever been before!

Nor was this all. The plan for proceeding to the Marquesas was providentially defeated. Instead of remaining at the Sandwich Islands but three weeks, as they had contemplated, the deputation were confined there more than as many months, and made a strong impression on the natives, and greatly strengthening the hands of the missionaries: and finally, at the earnest request of the king and his chiefs, Mr. Ellis, and the Taheitean chief were induced, contrary to all their original plans and expectations, to take up a permanent residence there. Thus, the language of the islands has been soon-

er acquired by our missionaries, the Gospel has been sooner preached, and books have been sooner prepared, printed, distributed and read.

We think, moreover, that we have the key to the mystery, why Mr. Ellis was not permitted, in the Providence of God, to accompany the king to England: but not being quite certain of the fact, we shall not at present make use of it. Thus much we can say. Every providence seems to have had a merciful bearing upon the mission: and we can see how almost every thing, which, at the time appeared adverse, has been overruled for good.

The preceding remarks we have been led into, by a consideration of the influence, which the king's death might have on the mission to his subjects. As the Lord hath done in time past, so we trust he will do in time to come. He has provided for the exigencies of that mission, when man could not foresee them, and of course could not provide for them. Man is short-sighted and feeble; kings and rulers are subject to death: but the "Lord reigneth—let the multitude of isles be glad thereof."

SAMARITANS.

[THE following account of an interview, with the Samaritans dwelling at Sychar is from the Journal of Mr. Fisk, published in the Missionary Herald.]

After taking some refreshment we went to visit the Samaritans, having first sent to the Kohen, or Priest, to know if a visit would be agreeable. His name is Shalmar ben Tabiah. His first name he sometimes pronounces Salomer. I believe it is the same as Solomon, which the Jews in Jerusalem now pronounce Shloma. He received us in a neat apartment, and we immediately entered into conversation. Ten or twelve other members of the sect soon came in. Our conversation was in Arabic. They represent the number of their houses to be 20 or 30,—about 60 pay the capitation tax. They say there are no other Samaritans in this country, but they are quite disposed to think they are numerous in other parts of the world. In Paris they suppose they were very numerous, until, in a time of war between the French and some other nation, the Samaritans were dispersed. They say that there are, however, four still living in Paris. They inquired whether there are any Samaritans in England, and seemed not at all gratified when we told them no. On learning that I was from America, they inquired if there are Samaritans there. I told them no; but they confidently asserted the contrary, and that there are also many in

India. They maintain that they are the lineal descendants of Jacob: the Kohen and his sons, only, of the tribe of Levi; one family from the tribe of Benjamin; four or five from Manasseh, and the rest from Ephraim. We asked what they would do for a priest, if the Kohen and his sons should die, and thus the tribe of Levi become extinct. They replied, (bah zah ma beseer,) "this does not happen." They all speak Arabic, but their books and public prayers are in Samaritan. They call their language Hebrew, and that which we call Hebrew they call Jewish; for they say their language is the true Hebrew in which the law was given. The difference consists in the use of a different alphabet and different pronunciation. They go three times a year to Mount Gerizim to worship, but do not offer sacrifices there now, as they did formerly, lest they should be molested by the Turks. But they offer their sacrifices in a more private way, in the city. We understood them to say, that they have no daily sacrifice. We visited their synagogue. It is a small dark, but neat room, with an altar, but without seats. We were obliged, before entering, to pull off not only our over-shoes, but also our slippers, which are not prohibited even in mosques; and Mr. Jowett was obliged to take off an outer garment, which he wears, that is lined with fur. No person can approach the altar, except the Kohen and his sons. They expect a Messiah, who is to be a Prophet and King, but a mere man, to live 120 years, as Moses did, and to reign at Naploos over all the world. Those who do not receive him, are to be destroyed with the sword. The promise concerning the woman's seed does not, they believe, refer to the Messiah; but that, concerning a prophet like unto Moses, does refer to him, as does also that concerning Siloh. Gen. 49:10. They admit the sense of this passage as given in our translation, and try to show that there is still a sceptre somewhere in the hands of Judah. The Messiah will come when Israel repent. They say the story of the separation between Israel and Judah, under Jeroboam and Rehoboam, is a lie of the Jews. The city of Luz or Bethel, they say, was on Mount Gerizim. Gen. 28:19. Jebus, they say, was also on this mount, and that Judges 19:10 as it stands in our copies, is not true.

20. We renewed our visit to the Samaritans. We had yesterday requested to see their ancient copy of the law. The Kohen objected, but after much persuading, and indirectly presenting the motive which generally prevails in this country, i.e. the offer of money, he at last consented to show it to us this morning. In order to do it, he said he must first bathe, and then put on a particular dress for the oc-

casion. On our arrival at the synagogue, we waited a short time, and he appeared, entered the synagogue, approached the altar, kneeled and put his face to the floor, then opened the little closet which contained the holy book, kneeled and put his face to the floor again, then brought out the brass case, which contained the roll, and opened it so as to show us the manuscript, but we were not allowed to touch it. It is in the Samaritan character, and the Kohen says it was written by Abishua, the grandson of Aaron, thirteen years after the death of Moses, and 3260 years ago. See 1 Chron. 6:4. Another brass case stood near this, containing an exact copy of the original manuscript, said to have been made 800 years ago. On a shelf in the synagogue, were a considerable number of copies of the Samaritan Pentateuch. We saw also the relic of the Polyglott Bible mentioned by Maundril. The Bible of the Samaritans contains only the five books of Moses. They have however, Joshua and Judges, but in separate books. They say that since Joshua there has been no prophet. He was the disciple of Moses, and inferior to him. David was king in Jerusalem, but not a prophet. We inquired whether the Samaritans held it lawful to read the books of Christians. They said there was no law against it, and we left with them one Testament in Arabic, and another in Hebrew.

At noon we left Naploos. A little way from the gate we observed, on our right hand, a mosque, which I suppose to be the one that travellers have mentioned as the place bought by Jacob "at the hand of the children of Hamor, Gen. 33:19. Jacob's well is to be seen near by, but through the ignorance of our guide we missed it. At six o'clock we arrived at Singil, and took lodgings with a Greek family, the only Christian family in the place. Before our arrival, we were overtaken by a heavy rain.

REVIVAL OF RELIGION IN GERMANY.

To the Editor of the (London) Baptist Magazine.

SIR,

Two pious German ministers of the reformed church, named J. Christian Reichardt, and J. George Wermelskirk, gave me, this morning, the following account of the revival of religion in Germany.

It was not till since the close of the war, that any general attention was excited respecting evangelical religion. Five years ago there were five or six ministers belonging to each of the churches in Berlin, which amount to twenty-one, but not any of them evangelical persons; now there is no church where there is not, at least, one

pious, evangelical pastor, preaching the doctrines of the Gospel, and adorning it by their conduct.

In the University of Berlin, there are thirty or forty pious students. One of the professors, of the name of Tholock, about twenty-five years of age, who knows fifteen languages, is in the practice of receiving these every Wednesday at his own house, for the purpose of giving them religious instruction. About ten of these usually associate with my informant on a Saturday evening, at the University, for praying with them, and for reading and expounding the scriptures. Four of the professors in the University are pious evangelical men. One of these, named Neander, Professor of Evangelical History, is a converted Jew, of good reputation, and considerable standing.

When Professor Tholock was, some time since, at Copenhagen, he inquired for a long time in vain, at the University, after pious young men: at length, by accident, a person, who called at the inn, was discovered by him as being of that character, and he introduced him to a considerable number of pious youth, who were earnestly seeking after God.

The pious students, who have been mentioned as at the University at Berlin, were from different German Universities, and their statement respecting them was, that in all of them there were devoted youths, consecrating themselves to the service of God.

At Erlangen, in Bavaria, there are in the University three Professors; one of whom has the reputation of being one of the most learned men on the Continent.

At Basle, in Switzerland, they were informed, by one of their companions, that, in the year 1818, about twenty young men were brought to know the grace of God in truth. As they had no evangelical instructors, they frequently met together for reading the scriptures and prayer. One of these is engaged by the London Society for promoting the conversion of the Jews; and another named Burkhardt, brother to the late excellent Missionary, of that name, is an assistant minister with Dr. Steinkopff, in the Savoy, London.

At Albufelt, in Prussia, there is a minister of the Lutheran church, named Doring, the apostle of the age. He pays particular regard to young persons. On a Monday evening he collects at his house about two hundred unmarried men; and on a Wednesday evening, about forty young ladies; for the purposes of giving them religious instruction. He is indefatigable in visiting the prisons and hospitals, distributing religious tracts, and has been the instrument of the conversion of many to the knowledge of Christ. In all this vicinity, the churches are supplied

with, at least, twenty evangelical pastors. The people, when they want a minister, no longer inquire for those who are distinguished by their literature; but they say, when one is recommended to them, "Is he a pious minister?"

A minister named Couard, about thirty years of age, who preaches in a church in Berlin, has an excessively crowded congregation of six or seven thousand hearers: he lately preached seven sermons from "Ye must be born again." The churches are forsaken where the Gospel is not faithfully preached.

The same spirit of opposition exists there as in this country against evangelical religion. If they observe any to listen attentively, or appear serious and devout, they call them by way of reproach, "Head-hangers."

A person, from the neighbourhood of Brunswick, gave the following account. "Above five years since, there was not one pious person in all the neighbourhood, nor any evangelical minister. Two farmers were walking in their fields, when one of them, as if his mind had been instantly impressed with the subject, said, 'We possess all these riches, but we have never returned thanks to God, the giver of them. Surely we ought to do so. Come, let us kneel down, and give thanks, to God, and seek his pardon and blessing.' They enjoyed so much pleasure in this exercise, that they resolved to meet at one of their houses, on a Lord's-day evening, for praying and searching the scriptures. Their wives soon united with them. Others, who observed them thus assemble, asked, 'What are you doing? We will meet with you.' Thus, persons from different villages were collected, till the room was over crowded. These meetings were held in other adjacent villages, until there were ninety or an hundred serious persons. At length, one of the Lutheran pastors in the neighbourhood became an enlightened man, and now they all attend upon his ministry."

These revivals are attributed to the establishment of Bible and Missionary Societies; and the work of conversion has been so rapid, especially among students in the Universities, that scores of pious youths are burning with ardour to be employed in Missionary labours in any part of the globe.

The two ministers, who are very serious, well-informed persons, who related the above facts, are about to visit Poland, in the service of the London Society for the Conversion of the Jews. J. I.

THE SOCIETY IN SCOTLAND FOR THE PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE, has existed for nearly 120 years.

and is incorporated by royal charter. The Directors in their last annual report dated March 1824, say "Its ordinary funds and exertions have been directed almost exclusively to the education and religious instruction of the Poor in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland." Its operations have been uniform and steady for more than a century; during all which time no extraordinary call has been made on the charity of the public.—By its teachers, missionaries and catechists, the most important benefits have been conferred on a once rude and neglected population. 264 schools with 13,541 scholars, are supported by this Society, together with 11 missionaries, 16 catechists, and 38 superannuated teachers, at an annual expense of £4251. The Marquis of Bute is President of the Institution.

The Church Missionary Society have made preparation for the establishment of a Seminary for the education of their missionaries, at Islington near London. There are at least three other Missionary Seminaries in Europe—one at Gosport, (Eng.) one at Basle, (Switzerland,) one at Berlin, (Prus.)

At the last Monthly Concert in Boston, a letter from Mr. Garrett, at Bombay, who had received letters from Jaffna in Ceylon, communicated the very interesting intelligence that "*all the stations there have been favoured with the merciful visita-*

tions of the Holy Spirit, and that SIXTY OR SEVENTY NATIVES HAVE RECENTLY GIVEN EVIDENCE OF A SAVING INTEREST IN THE MERITS OF THE REDEEMER. Others are inquiring what they shall do to be saved."

GERMAN TESTAMENTS.

Not long since Messrs. Moser and Peters, two enterprising Germans, established in Carlisle, Pa. a foundery of Stereotype plates, and commenced the publication of an edition of the New Testament, in the German language, from the plates which they prepared. They have already printed and sold 2500 copies, and are now striking off another edition, which will make the number amount to between 3 and 4 thousand. They are retailed to subscribers well bound with clasps, after the German method, at the rate of 75 cents, and in sheets at 37 1-2 cents per copy. The demand for them has been very great, and the typographical execution of them does credit to the printers.

DONATIONS TO RELIGIOUS AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

(In the Month of September.)

To the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 4,404 77.

To the United Foreign Missionary Society, \$935 78.

To the American Education Society, \$358 67.

Ordinations and Installations

Sept. 1.—The Rev. ABIEL PARMELE, over the Presbyterian Church in Warsaw, N. Y.

Sept. 15.—The Rev. NATHANIEL CHAPMAN, over the Congregational Church and Society in Bristol, Me. Sermon by Rev. Professor Smith, of the Theological Institution at Bangor.

Sept. 21.—The Rev. JOHN B. STEELE, over the Reformed Dutch Church of Boght, N. Y. Sermon by the Rev. John Ludlow, of Albany.

Sept. 23.—The Rev. MICHAEL QUIN, over the Church in Patterson, N. Y. Sermon by the Rev. J. Dewing.

Sept. 26.—The Rev. WILLIAM WITHINGTON, was admitted to the order of Deacons, at Newburyport, by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Griswold. Sermon by the Bishop.

Sept. 28.—The Rev. ERASTUS MALT-

BY, as a Missionary of the Connecticut Missionary Society, and the Rev. LEONARD BACON, as an Evangelist, at Windsor, Con. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Robbins, of East Windsor.

Sept. 29.—The Rev. THOMAS WILLIAMS, over the Congregational Church and Society, of the West Parish in Attleborough, Mass. Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Emmons.

Sept. 29.—The Rev. ROBERT G. ARMSTRONG, over the Church and Congregation in Smithfield, N. Y. Sermon by the Rev. J. Dewing.

Sept. 30.—Messrs. HEMAN M. BLODGETT, JOSEPH I. FOOTE, STEPHEN FOSTER, JAMES NOYES, EDWARD PALMER, ZABDIEL ROGERS and ROYAL WASHBURN, as Evangelists, at Boxford, Mass. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Perry, of Boxford.

Oct. 6.—The Rev. HORACE SESSIONS, and the Rev. ELBRIDGE G. HOWE, as Evangelists at South Wilbraham, Mass. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Strong, of Somers, Con.

Oct. 6.—The Rev. H. HERSEY, at Barnstable, Mass. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Palfrey, of Boston.

Oct. 6.—The Rev. JUBILEE WELLMAN, over the Congregational Church in Frankfort, Me. Sermon by the Rev.

Professor Fowler, of the Theological Seminary at Bangor.

Oct. 12.—The Rev. JAMES MARSH, Professor of Languages and Belles Lettres in Hampden Sidney College, was ordained at Hanover, N. H. to the work of the Ministry.

Oct. 20.—The Rev. WILLIAM MITCHELL, at Watertown, as an Evangelist, by the South Consociation of Litchfield, Con.

View of Public Affairs.

FOREIGN.

SPAIN.—The fortress of Tariffa, mentioned in our last as having been taken on the 4th of August by a body of exiled Constitutionalists, was retaken by storm on the 19th, by the French and Spanish troops. The prisoners were delivered up for trial. We hear nothing further of the prospect of a "simultaneous struggle" throughout Spain. The affair of Tariffa seems to have been a mere act of desperation on the part of the exiles.

FRANCE.—The death of LOUIS XVIII. was announced at London, on the 13th of September. He is succeeded by his brother, the Count d'Artois, whose title is Charles X.

GREECE.—Among the most interesting events in the history of the Greek revolution are the taking and retaking of the island of Ipsara. The Captain Pacha, after spending a month at Mytilene in raising and concentrating his force, set sail on the 3d of July, with a fleet said to consist of more than 180 vessels, and carrying from 30 to 40,000 men. The forces of Ipsara amounted to about 7000. On the morning of the 4th the Pacha commenced landing which he effected without difficulty in consequence of the treachery of 300 Albanians to whom the only two places favourable for a landing had been confided, and who instead of defending these important posts turned their arms upon the Greeks. It became necessary that the

Greeks should abandon the town and castle and retire to their monasteries on the hills. Under one of these was a mine of powder. The Turks after two unsuccessful attacks upon it, increased their numbers for a third attempt, when the Greeks suffered them to rush in and then blew up themselves and enemies together. Many of their women and children also perished with them. The destruction of lives was great on both sides.—The Turks massacring all that fell in their way, and the Greeks defending themselves with desperation. Even women were seen contending hand to hand with the barbarians, and when they had no other means of avoiding captivity, throwing themselves and their children into the sea.

The Captain Pacha, having accomplished the object of the expedition, returned to Mytilene, leaving the desolated island in possession of 2000 of his Egyptian troops.

But the possession of Ipsara by the Turks was of short duration. Three days after its capture, the Greek government at Napoli di Romania sent to its aid a fleet of more than 50 sail; the result of which was that nearly the whole of the Turkish fleet and garrison left at the island were destroyed. Various accounts estimate the aggregate loss of the Turks at from eight to upwards of twenty thousand men. Among them were the 300 traitors, whom the enraged Greeks annihilated during the first attack.

Answers to Correspondents.

S. W. is received.

I. P. W. and A. B. are necessarily deferred.

Q. B. will probably hear from us through the friend whom he undertakes to vindicate.

We handed W. L.'s communication to K. as he requested. Our only objection to publishing it, is its inconclusiveness. It is written with an excellent spirit, but discovers a want of that knowledge of the Scriptures in their original languages, and of Biblical Archæology which is indispensable to a proper investigation of the subject.